

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

MANY books have been written since the War about the failure of the Church, and many reasons have been given for the failure. To do the Church justice, it has read these books and considered the reasons. And not without result. There is probably not one Church in Christendom that stands exactly where it did when the War began. Another book has been written. It has reasons also. We shall read it and consider.

It is an unlovely book to look at. The publishers have missed their opportunity. For the author, Mr. Joshua HOLDEN, is no ordinary author. He has the welfare of the Church of Christ right honestly at heart. He speaks the more boldly on that account. And he has reasons that are worth attending to.

Take him in the middle. 'The question at issue is not whether religion should be sacramental or non-sacramental in type, whether priestly or prophetic. It would be futile to limit the ways in which men may approach God, and to reduce the churches to some common factor of uniformity in ritual or belief would be equally useless. The paralysis from which all churches are suffering does not arise from what is distinctive in each, but from defects which are common to them all. Three in particular may be specified, namely, their materialism, professionalism and sectarianism.'

What does he mean by materialism? Not philosophical materialism. No philosophical or other theory is in his mind at all. Not worldliness even. By materialism he means the influences that come from the possession of wealth.

But take his concession first. 'Wealth is still one of the conditions of a complete intellectual and social training. Jesus chose His disciples from men who were neither rich nor poor. They had enough wealth for their ordinary needs but not enough to secure more than an average education. It was the greater wealth of Paul's family that permitted him to go from Tarsus to Jerusalem and sit at the feet of Gamaliel. Had Paul been poor, he would probably not have displayed so wide an intellectual range or so great a power of adaptation. Further, a vow of poverty is not essentially Christian. Arbitrary limitations of circumstance, that do not arise from the actual needs of our individual or communal life, are a travesty rather than an expression of the spirit of Jesus.'

Again, he does not refer to the unfair advantage over a Church which the man of means sometimes exercises. There are two ways in which money is materialism for a Church. One way is to make its members too comfortable. While life is easy outwardly, it is scarcely possible to make it

spiritual within. The other is the open way in which the raising of money is made an end in itself.

'Take for example the work of foreign missions for which money is indispensable. Every missionary society has for one of its objects the raising of money. Local efforts are made, and the local results achieved are obvious to every member; but the purpose for which the money is subscribed is only dimly realized. It often happens that very successful financial missionary efforts do not lead to a wider or more intelligent interest in mission work in India or China or Africa. There is no real missionary enthusiasm; the success is limited to finance. And this failure to distinguish between means and ends is typical of much of the work of the churches. Their main efforts and interests are financial. If money was not needed for the ministry, buildings and church funds, many churches would not have much work left for them to do. But this indicates a materialistic conception of church work and an entire misunderstanding of the meaning of Christian discipleship.'

Pass to Professionalism. What is that? If you will read the quotations which are made in 'Entre Nous' from a sermon by the Bishop of Nassau you will understand at once. But listen also to Mr. HOLDEN. And again take the concession first. 'In the interests of order and the competent administration of the churches, specialization of function such as is involved in the establishment of a definite class of ministers and lay officials, seems to me to be inevitable.' That is the concession.

'But in the larger interest both of the churches and the world every liability to officialism should be carefully reduced. Every church needs to foster the spirit of adventure and to leave room for experiment so that alongside or, it may be, springing out of the old, the spirit of Jesus may find expression in new ways suited to the new times. If this is to be done the churches must

be careful to free both ministers and officials from any selfish interest in the maintenance of the existing order of things. In the Free Churches this is the more needful because ministers often find their hopes frustrated by the timidity, ignorance or selfishness of the laity. Free churchmen are losing their zest for spiritual freedom, and it is often the congregation rather than the minister that is responsible for the humdrum and stereotyped life of the church.'

Lastly, Sectarianism. And once more consider first the concession. 'The divisions that separate the churches are often regarded as a serious cause of offence, and no taunt is more frequently flung at the churches than that of their bigotry and sectarianism. A clear distinction, however, needs to be drawn between the sections or sects into which the Christian Church is divided and the spirit of sectarianism. The idea of heresy and schism in the Roman Church sprang from a belief in the right of the church to fix the standards of orthodoxy, both in faith and practice. Heresy, therefore, was unavoidable wherever men had courage to think for themselves, and schism was a possibility the church had vigorously to guard against.'

Again, 'most church divisions have been due to the failure of an older system to make room for the exuberance of its younger members. Now in so far as these divisions correspond to real differences in belief or to obviously alternative modes of government, it is to be hoped, in the interests of variety and fullness of life, that they will continue to exist. The modern doctrine of religious freedom and toleration implies a diversity of churches corresponding to the variety of beliefs. Sects, then, are a modern inevitability, and should not be an offence to any candid person to-day. The formal unity of the churches would imply a larger measure of agreement in faith and practice, ritual and administration, than is now possible. To expect it would be as foolish as to expect an Esquimaux and a negro to live on the same diet;

and it would be equally undesirable. The truest catholicity lies in the recognition of the spiritual unity of all sections of the Christian Church despite their differences in polity and creed, and those Christians are least tainted with sectarianism for whom the chimera of formal union has no charm because they rejoice in the breadth of the vision of God and in the variety of man's approach to Him.'

More than that—for here the concession is of utmost consequence—'Catholicity of spirit is not inconsistent with an intense fidelity on the part of believers to the particular truths by which they themselves live. Men who have definite opinions about business and politics, literature and art, must grant a similar crispness of judgment in questions of theology and churchmanship. If religion matters at all, it is of the highest importance that men and women should have a reason for their faith, and be prepared, if necessary, to fight for it.'

'But this definiteness of faith often brings with it a dangerous narrowness of outlook that may lead to sectarianism of spirit. The Roman Church, for example, declines to recognize the Anglican and Free Churches as branches of the Catholic Church, and this conviction prevents Romanists from co-operating with churches beyond the pale of their theological recognition. Proselytism becomes a duty, religious toleration a crime. The insistence of many evangelical Christians on a particular doctrine of the atonement and a particular plan of salvation keeps them at a distance from Christians with a different theological belief. Or again, the Nonconformist belief in the necessary severance of church and state has often led to bitter disputes between the Established Church and dissenters. In these and many other instances, the danger lies in an over-emphasis of one truth to the neglect of other equally important truths. It is at their peril that men rest content with less than "every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God"; for otherwise the mind con-

tracts, the heart fails in sympathy, and the spirit of sectarianism enters in.'

'But I repeat'—you see he is back to the concession again, and wisely—'But I repeat, for it cannot be too clearly stated, that there is no necessary connexion between a definite and strongly held faith and the spirit of sectarianism. Paul withstood Peter to the face, for the sake of the truth in Christ as he understood it, but Paul was no sectary. John Howe, who left his living at Torrington rather than do violence to his conscience, breathed all his life an atmosphere of loving comprehension that besought God's blessing on all sections of His church; and Dale, of Birmingham, who at one stage of his career fought the battle for disestablishment with unerring singleness of purpose, was a man of noble catholicity of spirit. Fidelity to the truth men live by can never be forgone, nor can the church afford to lose the spirit of candour.'

The title of the book is *The Spirit of Jesus and the Churches* (Methuen; 3s. 6d. net).

Professor A. Seth PRINGLE-PATTISON, Emeritus Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh, has delivered a Presidential Address to the Theological Society of the New College, Edinburgh. Its subject is *The Duty of Candour in Religious Teaching* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. net).

There are excellent things in the address, expressed excellently. But as an address to theological students in Scotland it comes to nothing. It comes to nothing because of two vitiating suppositions that run through it. The one supposition is that theological students in Scotland believe just as much of the New Testament as Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON believes. The other is that they do not preach what they believe.

They do not preach what they believe. The

charge is often made. But it has never been made so candidly. What evidence is there? The only evidence referred to is a quotation from Canon Streeter. Now Canon Streeter is no authority here. His knowledge is confined to the Church of England, and even there it means no more than that certain preachers do not preach as Canon Streeter believes. That they believe as he believes and yet preach as he does not believe, there is no evidence whatever. As for Scotland, they who know more preachers than Canon Streeter is in the least likely to know declare emphatically that want of candour in their preaching is the last charge that can be brought against them.

But the other mistake is still more serious. Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON thinks that theological students in Scotland believe no more of the New Testament than he believes. How much does he believe? He believes all that is natural. He does not believe anything in the New Testament that is in any sense supernatural. He does not believe anything that goes beyond the ordinary working of God's providence as we see it in our day.

He does not believe in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Why not? Because it is impossible that any one should be raised from the dead? Apparently not. The possibility of miracles he allows. When the believer in miracles argues that 'the belief in miracles does not offend in any way against the law of causation: it introduces a supernatural cause acting directly and interfering for the time with the customary sequence of events,' Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON agrees. For, he says, 'the real question concerns not the abstract possibility of a miracle in general, but the actual occurrence of particular reported miraculous events.'

So it is a matter of evidence, of evidence for the particular miracle. What evidence is there for the resurrection of Jesus? To Professor PRINGLE-

PATTISON there is evidently none at all. He does not believe that even our Lord's disciples believed in it. He does not believe that it was believed in by St. Paul. But we must quote his own words.

'In the case of the Resurrection,' he says, 'we have to distinguish between the belief in the continued existence and spiritual activity of the Risen Lord and the account of the Resurrection as it stands in the Gospels. The former belief undoubtedly prevailed soon after the death of Jesus in the circle of his disciples and followers—based apparently on his "appearances" to individuals and to gatherings of the faithful. For this we have the testimony of St. Paul, who, it will be noted, includes in the list of such appearances his own vision on the way to Damascus, and draws no distinction between it and the earlier cases to which he refers. This belief and the phenomena on which it was avowedly based have to be distinguished from the circumstantial story of the Empty Tomb and its sequel, which we find in the Gospels. If St. Paul had known anything of such a story, it is impossible, laying the stress he does upon the Resurrection, that he should not have referred to evidence so remarkable. But not only does he not mention it: his own distinction, in the context, between the natural and the spiritual body is inconsistent with the resuscitation of the physical body of Jesus as implied in the narrative. St. Paul's theory belongs to a higher level of thought. As for ourselves, we no longer believe (any more than St. Paul) in the resurrection of our own physical bodies, and it is impossible for us to think otherwise of the physical organism of Jesus. But if the belief in our own continued spiritual existence remains unaffected by our abandoning the idea of a "resurrection of the flesh," *a fortiori* its abandonment in the case of Jesus does not affect belief in the living Lord.'

Now it is easy enough to explain why St. Paul does not refer to 'the circumstantial story of the Empty Tomb and its sequel, which we find in the Gospels.' He never refers to anything of the

kind. He takes it all for granted. He has a certain foundation to build upon. That foundation is laid, and he simply proceeds to build upon it. Nothing is surer in criticism than that, and it is surprising that Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON should not have known it.

But if St. Paul did not believe in the physical resurrection, what sort of resurrection did he believe in? That he believed in a resurrection of some kind is evident enough, and Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON allows it. That he, and not he only but all the writers of the New Testament, believed in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, and not only believed in it but built up the New Testament on that belief, is beyond the possibility of dispute. What resurrection did they believe in if it was not the resurrection of their Lord's body?

Does Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON believe in a resurrection of any kind? He does not. There lies the difference. And no arrangement of words will bridge it. He says it is all a matter of evidence. But that is a mistake. As he himself says on another page, 'The view taken will always be found to depend on foregone conclusions of the reasoner as to the general nature of the universe.' And when the reasoner begins with these foregone conclusions no kind or quantity of evidence will affect him. He says that 'logically,' that is, scientifically or philosophically, he cannot deny the possibility of such a miracle. All the same it is just its possibility that he does deny.

Bishop Charles GORE has published a sermon on *The Fall of Man* (Mowbray), which he 'preached in substance' in Balliol College Chapel on January 30th, and in St. Paul's Cathedral on February 13th, 1921. Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON, in the Address already referred to, also touches the Fall. Let us hear Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON first.

'There are three sources, three layers of tradi-

tion, more or less loosely woven together in Genesis, and in the first chapter, which represents the latest of the three, the story moves with a simple dignity which is not without a certain sublimity, however out of touch it may be with scientific fact. But when we pass to chapters ii. and iii., and come to a Creator who "forms" man out of clay and then breathes into his nostrils, and by a subsequent operation extracts one of the man's ribs and makes a woman out of it, who walks in the garden in the cool of the day, and eventually turns tailor and makes coats of skin for Adam and his wife—when we meet a snake that talks and an apple-tree that is taboo, it should not be necessary to say anything more as to the kind of world in which we are moving. It is folk-lore undiluted, and anthropology furnishes countless parallels.'

Now let us hear Bishop GORE. 'If it means that as we read the great story of the Garden of Eden and the temptation and fall of Adam and Eve in the third chapter of Genesis, we are to recognize that this, and indeed all the early chapters of Genesis, are not history, then I would wholly agree. I can never imagine how people so long supposed that these early chapters were a historical record of actual events as they occurred. They are plainly folklore such as mostly lies behind human history. There was no garden in Mesopotamia at a particular date with a particular man and woman, and a serpent and certain wonderful trees. But can we be so ignorant as not to know that mankind has been taught through myth and fable and legend, at least as often as by accurate history? These early stories of Genesis have their root in a folklore which is found also recorded on the Babylonian tablets.'

Is there any difference between them? There is none. So when Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON goes on to say: 'It will behove our expositors, in the interests of an intelligent Christianity, to make themselves quite plain as to the stratum of thought to which these narratives belong, stating the case

not as if it were an acknowledgment reluctantly wrung from them, but *ex animo* and *con amore*, as what no trained mind can fail to perceive to be true'—we refer him to Bishop GORE. This is just what one of 'our expositors' does. He does it *ex animo* and *con amore*. And which of 'our expositors' does anything else? But now mark what follows.

Says Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON: 'It will be the more incumbent upon them [our expositors] to be explicit and emphatic here, because so much of Christian theology since the time of St. Paul has been built on the idea of the Fall of man, and has incorporated in its construction the incidents of this primitive story, allegorising the snake in the process into "that old serpent the Devil." St. Paul, it is true, does not go beyond generalities ("As in Adam all fell"), but later theologians, as we all know, have not hesitated to trace the whole "estate of sin and misery into which man fell," the burden of original sin and all its consequences, to the unhappy curiosity of the eponymous mother of mankind, not unnaturally excited by a wholly unintelligible taboo.'

The language is uncomfortably reminiscent of the mob orator at the street corner, but what is the meaning? We may pass the reference to St. Paul's 'generalities'—a man not much given to generalities, if we know him. The meaning is that there is no such thing as original sin. Does Bishop GORE agree with that? His sermon is preached for the very purpose of showing that he does not agree.

The phrase may be open to objection; Dr. GORE does not use it. But what is meant by 'original sin' is that there is more in humanity to be accounted for than the particular transgressions you or I may be guilty of. It asserts—here are Dr. GORE'S words — 'it asserts not only that particular men or women have done wrong and reaped the penalty of wrongdoing, but that back behind all these particular sins and sinners, some-

how humanity—human nature as a whole—has gone wrong.' Has Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON taken account of that? He has not. And yet he might have taken account of it. Science takes account of it now—nothing more emphatically. Even philosophy has begun to take account of it. And when you turn to literature, the great literature of the world, you find that it has been taken account of all the time.

Bishop GORE turns to Shakespeare. 'No man was ever less of a preacher or a reformer than William Shakespeare. He was a child of the Renaissance. He wanted simply to observe human nature in all its endless and fascinating variety and to present its living image in the forms of his imagination, just as it is, good and bad together, all fascinating, all interesting. Nevertheless we note as we read his plays in order of time, as far as we may, how there grows upon him one awful impression: that somehow the human soul is perverted or obsessed with passions which work its ruin. This conviction is expressed with terrible intensity in the Sonnet on Lust:

"All this the world well knows: but who knows
well

To flee the heaven which leads men to this
hell."

It becomes the dominant motive of the great tragedies. It may be ambition in Macbeth, and vanity in King Lear, and lust in Antony, and jealousy in Othello, and pride in Coriolanus; but in all it is some perverting or obsessing passion which hands the human soul over to the ministers of its perdition. Shakespeare has no remedy. He remains to the end only the spectator. And this is not the place to ask how at last he found relief from this awful spectacle which at one time seems as if it would be too much for the sanity of even that mighty mind. But when I hear of St. Paul as taking a too severe view of human nature, I cannot but ask, Was it severer than Shakespeare's—or than Shelley's? Do they not both tell us that there is about human nature an awful secret

which experience discloses—a perversion or obsession deep down and seemingly ineradicable?’

‘I would say, then, to you’—this is Bishop GORE’s concluding message (he seems to hear Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON delivering his address)—‘I would say, then, to you as my message to you for Lent. If you are told in the newspapers or by clever men that the Fall of Man is a figment of the imagination of St. Paul or the Middle Ages and the Reformation, look narrowly at experience both in yourself and in the world. Listen to the deepest exponents of human experience—to a Dante and a Milton, to a Shakespeare and a Shelley—and tell your intelligent friends that, whether the story of the Garden is a historical statement or a symbol, either way it speaks a truth which it is folly and blindness to ignore: that your own nature and human nature in the gross, if it is to be saved from failure, needs something more than enlightenment, it needs redemption from sin: and that, as far as you can hear, there is none other name given under heaven whence mankind can look for this redemption than the Name of Jesus of Nazareth.’

There are Jews to-day whom we can look upon and love, as Jesus looked upon and loved the rich young ruler. There are Jews to-day of whom we can say, as He said of a certain Jew in His day, ‘Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.’

What hinders them from entering? Two things. First, the Christian claim that the Messiah as conceived in the Old Testament is divine as well as human. And next, the Christian belief that the Messiah had to suffer and die. So says Professor BURNEY.

The Rev. C. F. BURNEY, D.Litt., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford, has prepared a volume of sermons which has been published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark as one of the volumes of the ‘Scholar as Preacher’ series. Its title is *The Gospel in the Old Testament* (12s.).

It is a notable book; in certain ways most significant. For Professor BURNEY is a higher critic of the most pronounced manner, and yet he finds in the Old Testament—he finds throughout the Old Testament, from Genesis to Malachi—that very truth which he has himself expressed in the title of his book—the Gospel.

Not the Gospel in the full flower of it. But in the seed and in the bud—most unmistakably the seed and the bud which the coming of Christ into the world made to bring forth so abundantly. We see in Professor BURNEY’S sermons, as we may never have seen before, what our Lord meant when He said, ‘I came not to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil.’

It is in the middle of the book that we come upon the objections which the modern Jew has—even such Jews as Mr. Claude Montefiore—to sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of God. They are, as we have seen, these two—the divinity of the Messiah and His shameful death.

Professor BURNEY says little about the divinity. What can he say? There is no doubt that Jesus Himself found in the Old Testament a Messiah who was divine as well as human. What else was the point of His argument with the Pharisees regarding the 110th Psalm? It was a thoroughly Rabbinic argument. To say that it pins our Lord down to the Davidic authorship of the psalm is to miss the meaning of it. And then there is the fact that He knew Himself to be the fulfilling of the Messianic ideal of the Old Testament, and to be divine.

On the objection of the Jews to the death of the Messiah, especially His death on a cross, Professor BURNEY has much more to say. It was the death on the Cross, far more than the fact of death, that caused them to stumble. For they took the words in Deuteronomy (21²³), ‘cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree,’ to refer to

crucifixion. But the modern Jew, at least the modern liberal Jew, does not interpret that passage so. To him the objection simply is that, properly interpreted, the prophecies concerning the Messiah do not predict His death.

Whereupon Professor BURNET sets before us and them, in masterly survey, the history of the Messianic conception, from the making of the covenant with Abraham until it is taken up by the author of the great section in the Book of Isaiah which begins with the fortieth chapter. There 'it is applied in the first place to Israel as a body entrusted with a mission to the world at

large. Then, as it comes home to the writer how far Israel as a whole is from answering to his ideal conception, it is narrowed down to the righteous nucleus of the nation, the Israel within Israel who has a mission first of all to his own nation, and is then to carry Jehovah's salvation to the ends of the earth. Finally, the conception takes shape in the picture of the Servant in ch. liii. realizing his mission through suffering and death, yielding up his soul as a guilt-offering for the sins of the world, rising again to a glorious future in which he is to be the spiritual father of a renewed community, and the pleasure of Jehovah is to prosper in his hand.'

Missions and the Study of the New Testament.

BY THE REVEREND J. F. MCFADYEN, M.A., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, QUEEN'S COLLEGE, KINGSTON.

AT the beginning of the War, when our statesmen were enunciating their war aims, it took them some time to realize that the Empire included not only Britain and the self-governing dominions, but some hundreds of millions of coloured citizens, many of whom were making their own application of the official pronouncements; and that if the statements of war aims were not to lead to unfortunate results they must be made with much more circumspection. Has not something of the same kind happened in connexion with the Christian Church during the last century? The Church of the West knows in a general way that Churches have been organized in Asia and Africa, Churches which have been rapidly growing in numbers, in self-consciousness, in a sense of responsibility and spiritual power. Yet so long as these organizations are vaguely described as native Churches and treated as an adjunct of foreign missions, it is difficult for us to realize our essential unity with them and make the necessary adjustments in our whole conception of the Christian Church.

To confine ourselves to one aspect of the subject, let us ask ourselves whether the study of missions and the new Churches on the one hand and the study of the New Testament on the other

have been allowed sufficiently to interact on each other. It is not necessary to elaborate the point that the foreign missionary and the leaders of the young Churches are indebted at every turn to the New Testament student; but it is well for the New Testament student sometimes to remind himself that he is now speaking to a larger audience than heretofore, an audience, moreover, with far more varied and complicated needs. It is said that two generations are required for the results of Biblical scholarship to filter down to the non-reading public even of the West. Perhaps it would be safe to allow another generation to take them to the average member of the Indian or the African Church. When we attempt to formulate Christian doctrine or direct Christian sentiment, it gives us pause to remember that our works will live after us in distant communities some generations hence.

It is, *e.g.*, disappointing to see a young Indian Christian, after graduating at an Indian university, and studying theology under Western teachers in an Indian seminary for three years, start off to teach for the measure of his lifetime doctrines which have long since been abandoned even in conservative circles in the West. This is obviously

not the fault of the Indian, but it is the Indian Church that suffers for our sins.

I. THE CONTRIBUTION OF THEOLOGICAL STUDY TO MISSIONS.

Apart from the more obvious forms of the indebtedness of missions to the student of theology, every branch of theological study in the widest sense has its contribution to make to the work of evangelization and Church building in the wider world. The Hindu, *e.g.*, believes as firmly as most Christians that Christianity is a natural inheritance of the West. The historian who can tell us something of pre-Christian Britain, something of the story of its conversion, is providing the missionary with a useful asset. The Hindu also is apt to think that Christianity is Western in its origin, which accounts in no small measure for whatever prejudice he has against it. It is a fruitful and interesting subject of study, how far Europe, Asia, and Africa contributed to Christianity as we know it.

For the New Testament student many questions that would otherwise be of little more than antiquarian interest take on a new complexion when he realizes that they are living issues in Churches of the living present. Churches are being built from the foundation, creeds hammered out, codes of ethics developed. On all these subjects the student of theology can give guidance; but if it is to do more good than harm, it must be guidance of a different kind from that of the not very distant past, when virtue was supposed to lie in a purely external imitation of the early Church.

(1) To take a typical question that is very relevant to the situation of the Indian Christian, Were Paul and the other apostles wrong when they refused to identify themselves with the Pharisaic political programme? Missionaries and Hindus alike taunt the educated Indian Christians of to-day with being 'denationalized'. They are blamed because, on the one hand, they have for the most part held aloof from the 'nationalist' propaganda, while on the other hand, they have tended to adopt foreign dress, a foreign language, foreign manners and customs. In India the question is complicated by the fact that Christianity comes with the prestige of the ruling race.

It is characteristic of our age that 'denationalization' if it can be proved is regarded as a deadly crime. But surely the relative claims of religion

and nationality, the extent to which a change so vital as that from Hinduism to Christianity may reverberate through the whole life, are big enough questions to make us hesitate to decide whether truth lies with the 'patriotic' or with the 'denationalized' Christian, if indeed it is a question of truth and error at all.

In particular the wide-spread prejudice against what is supposed to be a Western type of Church service might at least be mitigated if it were more widely known that our 'Western' service is largely a continuation of the old synagogue worship.

(2) Perhaps on the mission field no ethical and legal questions arise more frequently and are more difficult to solve than those which concern marriage. Our Lord's teaching on marriage is, on a superficial view, apt to seem disappointing and on a lower level than the rest of His teaching, until we realize that He is not speaking of specifically Christian marriage at all. He is dealing, as on the mission field we are bound to do, with marriage in general, with the essence of the institution. The question often arises, how far is a Christian entitled or bound to recognize marriages which have been contracted legally and in all good faith and yet which are of a nature to shock Christian sentiment?

One form of the question inevitably arises in countries where polygamy is practised. How is the Christian Church to deal with a polygamous convert? Is he to be compelled to separate from all his wives except one, and if so, which one? When the question arose a few years ago in the Presbyterian Church in India, it was noticeable that in the discussion and even in the decision, a powerful factor was a curious interpretation of the passage in 1 Timothy where it is laid down that a bishop must be the husband of one wife. This was often understood to mean that the bishop must not be a bigamist, and the strange and even alarming corollary was drawn that there is nothing anomalous in an ordinary member of the Church having more than one wife. Probably none of those who adopted this view would have carried it out to its logical conclusion; but the discussion brought vividly to light the need for a wider popularization of accurate interpretation of the New Testament.

(3) A vexed question in the strategy of modern missions is the attitude to be taken to the non-Christian religions we seek to supplant. Are they

simply devices of the devil, as a former generation tended to think them, or are they a preparation for the gospel, according to the more cheerful philosophy of our own day? It is noticeable that those who know the non-Christian religions from the inside tend perhaps more often than the foreign missionary to retain the older and narrower view. Thus Pandita Ramabai, perhaps the foremost living Indian Christian, has 'turned away with loathing from the inheritance of Hinduism, whether as a religious system or as a body of legend and tradition. Herself a Sanskrit scholar, she would not allow her daughter to learn Sanskrit. For her Hinduism is quite simply the power of darkness, and from it the Christian can obtain nothing good.' (Quoted from Dr. N. MacNicol in the *International Review of Missions*.)

Are we likely in this matter to get beyond the sane and practical wisdom of New Testament writers and preachers? They will have no compromise with immorality in any shape or form. These are works of Satan. They will give no quarter to any system of philosophy that deprives Jesus of His supreme place. A curse rests on all such gospels. But the pre-Christian religions were often the morning twilight. Jesus was the Messiah of Jewish expectations, the Suffering Servant of prophetic insight, the ideal High Priest, the fulfilment of the Levitical system, the Logos of Alexandrian philosophy, the revelation of the unknown God whom the Athenians were already worshipping when Paul preached Jesus to them.

II. THE CONTRIBUTION OF MISSIONS TO THEOLOGICAL STUDY.

If the missionary and the young Churches are hourly indebted to the New Testament student, it is even more important that an intimate acquaintance with the mission field irradiates the New Testament. To find the meaning of the New Testament we have to climb a hill and look at other lands and other civilizations than our own. For one thing, in many, perhaps in most, mission fields, the whole conditions of life have a Bible flavour.

India is not Palestine, yet India and Palestine are both in the East. Take the panorama of life as it used to pass before one's door. A raucous, incessant cry for alms heralds the approach of a blind beggar. The driver of a passing bullock-cart is goading his animals beyond their strength, as

they stumble along beneath their yoke, weary and heavy-laden. A leper approaches, perhaps a band of lepers clasping hands, with their loathsome sores and their pitiful cries for help. Tempted by the wares of an itinerant fruit-seller, you ask him their price, and he replies, 'What Sahib pleases.' On a cot in the near distance lies a 'holy man,' clothed principally in dust and ashes, superbly indifferent to the reverent gaze of the squatting group of admirers. A visitor enters with a graceful salaam and an exaggerated expression of joy and humility. The patter of feet in the distance and the sound of a mournful chant intimate the approach of a funeral procession, following the corpse carried by bearers on an open bier. In the heat of the day a passing cartman tethers his beast to a tree and lies down to rest under its shade. A woman on the road takes a fit of some kind, and the bystanders explain that she is devil-possessed. In the evening a Mussulman, overtaken on the road by the close of day, spreads his praying-carpet on the ground and performs his devotions with face to the setting sun. Might not the picture in many of its details have walked out of the Bible?

These things are more or less external; but the parallel between social, political, and religious conditions in modern India and in the Palestine of Jesus' day is in many respects extraordinary.

(1) Palestine was a trilingual country. In India practically every educated man speaks English and his own vernacular, while over a large part of India Hindi is the *lingua franca*. The Aramaisms and Latinisms in New Testament Greek have innumerable parallels in the everyday speech and writing of India.

(2) As Palestine was part of the Roman Empire, so India is part of the British Empire. Jewish resentment at the foreign yoke is paralleled in ever-increasing degree in modern India. In each case the power which is politically subordinate is in its own estimation religiously superior. To the modern Brahmin as to the Pharisee of Jesus' day, the position is that a people with the exclusive and privileged possession of an ancient and highly spiritual religion is in political subordination to a foreign and heathen power.

As the tax-gatherers who ultimately worked for the Roman Empire were often corrupt and cruel in their methods, so there are much corruption and cruelty in the subordinate ranks of Govern-

ment service in India. The Pharisee discussed whether a loyal Jew could pay tribute to Cæsar, and a Brahmin student discusses whether a loyal Hindu can take service under the British raj. Jewish zealots find their counterpart in Indian extremists. There are Herodians in the native states whose power and prestige are dependent on the British suzerainty, and who are often quite satisfied with things as they are; while even among Brahmins there are Sadducees who have attained to power and wealth under the existing system and have no desire for change. The Brahmin contempt for the pariah and the mahar yields nothing in virulence to the cruelty of Pharisaic contempt for the tax-gatherer and the accursed people who knew not the law.

As in Palestine the political movement was inextricably intertwined with the religious, so in India to-day the political enthusiasm for Home Rule is only one phase of the Indian renaissance. Humiliated at the lowly place India takes among the nations, and at the torpor that has overtaken one province after another of the national life, India's leaders, sometimes with misdirected zeal, but sometimes in a spirit of sincere and lofty patriotism, strive to revive or develop Indian industries, Indian languages and literature, and Indian customs, dress, and social traditions, as well as India's political prestige. But India's prophets, like Judæa's in the days of Jesus, have their eyes on the past rather than on the future. They seek to exploit the intense religious conservatism of the land, and for the present, at least, the political revival goes hand in hand with a revival of the degrading puerilities of popular Hinduism.

(3) A study of the popular Brahmanism of the twentieth century is, in many of its aspects, a study of the Pharisaism of the first. There is the same rigorous performance of ceremonies of which the performers have almost forgotten to ask whether they ever had a meaning, the same mechanical repetition of prayers and religious formulæ, the same fasting and calculating alms-giving, the same self-satisfaction, conceit, and contempt. With the old mingling of the religious and political motive, there is the old unscrupulousness in the exploiting of them. The Brahmin has made the same perversion as the Jew of a spiritual religion, and is willing to endure the same discomfort in the pursuit of such religious ideals as he retains.

Two peoples have presented a stiff-necked resistance to the preaching of the gospel, the Jew and the Brahmin; and for the same reason. But as in the Gospel story the crowd, the common people, unless when they suffered their better judgment to be perverted by their religious leaders, had a far truer appreciation of Jesus than they, so in India it is the low-castes and the outcasts who hear Him gladly, and who are pressing by thousands into the Church of Christ.

(4) The question is sometimes asked: 'Do the Gospels give us a fair account of the Pharisees? Were they, in fact, so absorbed in the letter of the law, so impervious to its spirit, as the Gospels represent? And did they, in fact, feel themselves to be under a crushing load of legalism?'

Surely one answer is that the Gospels do not present a picture of an entirely unspiritual sect, that some of the most attractive characters in New Testament story belong to this class, though we have little detailed information. As among all classes of Hindus there is much genuine piety, and the teaching of the grace of God is no new thing even in India with its stern doctrine of retribution, so there were Pharisees of upright life, men who loved God and were grateful for His goodness and lived in His light. But further, the Gospels do not profess to give us an account of the Pharisees. Their one interest in the Pharisees is their relation to Jesus, and the chief fact in that relation was that it was the Pharisees who brought Jesus to the cross.

The literature of the Pharisees themselves shows, critics of the Gospel record tell us, no trace that they felt their religion as a grievous load. But the analogy of the modern Brahmin would lead us to conclude that those who conscientiously strove to fulfil the requirements of the law did feel it as a crushing burden, as Jesus said and as Paul implied by the exuberance of his joy at being delivered from it; that many men are wiser and better than their creed; and that multitudes do not feel their religion a burden only because they do not take it with sufficient seriousness to be crushed by it.

(5) Again, when we go with the New Testament in our hand to a non-Christian country, we are forced to realize, as perhaps we did not before, that in every line of it it is a missionary book. The New Testament interpreter usually has in view as his audience a settled Christian community, with creed, organization, and ethical code, so long

and so firmly established, that they have become part of the constitution of their world. But the New Testament deals with missionaries and mission churches, and if we are to understand it we must get rid of our staleness, try to forget all we have learned of our religion, and think ourselves into the new-born joy of the men who saw Jesus and heard Him, who watched Him die and saw Him risen. We have to follow them as, forgetting everything that had once been their life, they go wherever men are to be found, preaching deliverance through Jesus.

We can understand the story of the early days of the Church only as we share the wrestling of Paul and the other leaders with the problems of the young communities, problems intellectual, moral, and spiritual; only as we participate in the life of the unknown members of these Churches as they made their first assays of the new power that had come into the world, and their first responses, often feeble enough, to its new demands. On the mission field the story lives again.

(6) And we are reminded that the Christians of whom we read in the New Testament did not find life easy. Many of them lived in the presence of prison and the judgment-seat, the cross and the sword. The trail of blood runs through the story. It is a record of men and women who in not a few cases knew the worst the world could do, and yet in all these things were more than conquerors. Behind the books of the New Testament there are study, hard thinking, profound philosophy. Yet the New Testament is not a bookish book. It would be absurd to suggest that human nature can be found, and experience of life obtained, only in a lumber camp or on a gold field, only in an Indian jungle or an African kraal. But this we can say, that we enter into the spirit of the New Testament only in so far as we share in the conflict with that spirit of opposition to God and goodness which its writers called 'the world.'

(7) The progress of missions, in all countries, among all civilizations and religions, is the supreme apologetic of Christianity. One has heard a large audience of Hindus cheering to the echo a statement by Mrs. Besant that the Hindus had never proselytized. The Hindu congratulates himself on his profound indifference to his neighbour's faith. But to the Christian it is vital that his God is his brother's God, that his Saviour may become his brother's Saviour. If the human

brotherhood is not wide as the world, if there are sections of men that God cannot save to the uttermost when they come to Him through Jesus, then is our faith vain.

As the Christ goes on His conquering way through the nations of the world, we are reminded too that the New Testament is not a closed book. It tells us of the stern struggle with the Jews, the Judaizers, and the world religions of the first century. It has not a word to say of the conflict with Hindu Pantheism or Mohammedanism, with Confucianism or Buddhism. Are these struggles less titanic, do they make less exacting demands on the grace of God or the inspired wisdom and courage of the followers of Jesus? Are they less worthy of a place on the Christian record?

Perhaps one never realizes what the Church is up against in India till he has watched an educated Hindu audience listening to one making exclusive claims for Jesus, and noted their tolerant contempt for what they evidently regard as a piece of Western aggressiveness and conceit. In the presence of the subtle and often seductive philosophies of the East the Church is learning to know herself, as she learned to know herself when confronting the paganisms and the heresies of the first and second centuries.

(8) Mission experience sometimes sheds a new light on points of New Testament introduction. The question has been raised whether the frequent references to the Old Testament in the Epistles to the Galatians and the Hebrews imply that the readers were Jewish Christians. The suggestion cannot be taken seriously in the presence of members of mission churches to whom in their pre-Christian days the Old Testament was not even a name, but who have readily learned to regard it as one of their sacred books, to revel in such parts of it as they understand, and to find names for their children from its pages.

(9) Among people who have not even a traditional reverence for the name of Jesus one finds a new meaning in some of His sayings. Take the saying about the power of united prayer. Every one who has tried to lead an audience of Brahmins in anything that could be called prayer in the name of Jesus, whether the name of Jesus was actually used or not, must have felt at times as if there were a leaden weight attached to every word.

(10) The young Churches of to-day are labouring at least as earnestly as the older Churches, and

perhaps even more hopefully and effectively, at the work of Church building, Church uniting, Church organizing. We are learning the inevitableness of some of the measures adopted by the first Church leaders, and the folly of supposing that these were necessarily a norm for all time. We are learning that we are true imitators of the apostles, not when we walk blindly in what we suppose to have been their footsteps, but when we bring to bear on the religious problems of our day the same sanity, the same breadth of outlook, the same Christian charity, with which they faced the problems, often the very different problems, of their day. It is one of the tragedies of our religion that Paul, the apostle of liberty, Paul who spent his giant energy in seeking to deliver men from bondage to the law, became in turn a new law, from bondage to which we are only now beginning to deliver ourselves.

(11) It has long been a commonplace that when the patient East with its penetration and its capacity for loyalty has learned to know Jesus, it will find in Him treasures that we have missed. It would seem that part of India's contribution will be the discovery, or rather the re-discovery, of the law of Christian love. On no ethical point are the judgments of the European and the Indian Christian more often at variance than on the relative claims of justice, righteousness, and love; and we are being compelled to ask ourselves how far our emphasis on the sterner virtues is Christian, and how far it is only Anglo-Saxon.

(12) Lastly, on the mission field, we learn the meaning of the Christian sacraments. In old-established Christian communities where baptism and the Lord's Supper are fashionable routine ceremonies with a large admixture of superstition, it is right to emphasize that these are only symbols of the operation of the grace of God. But in a country where the baptism of the adult means the abandonment of all he has hitherto held dear, where sitting down at the Lord's table means adoption into a new community and open fellowship with Jesus, where both mean the end of hesitation and fear, the breaking down of the last barrier that hinders the free in-rush of the grace of God, one can at least understand the measure of truth that is in High Church conceptions of the sacraments, however little one may sympathize with the materialistic form in which they are so often held.

We repeat, the New Testament is a missionary book. There is not a line of it that is not written to lead men to believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, to build up converts in mission churches, to comfort them in their sorrows, to inspire them to new hope or fresh endeavour, or to solve their perplexities, intellectual, spiritual, or ecclesiastical. As we burrow in the sands of Egypt for documents that will shed light on the New Testament, let us not forget the light that comes from living epistles in the lands where the triumphs of the first Christian centuries are being re-enacted before our eyes.

Literature.

'THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY'

Two volumes of 'The International Critical Commentary' have just been published. The one is *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job*, by the late Samuel Rolles Driver, D.D., and George Buchanan Gray, D.Litt. (T. & T. Clark; pp. lxxviii, 736; 35s.). The other is *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, by Ernest De Witt Burton, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the University of Chicago (T. & T. Clark; pp. lxxxix, 541; 35s.).

They bring the great commentary within sight of the end. They are worthy of its reputation. No American scholar has or deserves higher honour in Great Britain than Professor Burton. With his *Moods and Tenses of the New Testament* he sprang at once into the front rank, just as Driver did with his *Hebrew Tenses*, and he has kept his place.

THE ENGLISH CATALOGUE.

From the Office of the Publishers' Circular has been issued *The English Catalogue of Books for 1920* (15s.). It contains the titles of all the books

which were published last year in the United Kingdom, from *A was an Archer* to *Zoology for Medical Students*; and it makes known the month of their publication, their size and price, and the name of their author. But the main entries, in clarendon type, are the authors' names, ranging from Abbey (R., Rev.) to Zymonidas (Alessandro). Then follow appendixes: first, Learned Societies, Printing Clubs, etc., with lists of their publications in 1920; and next a Directory of Publishers, English and American. It is all very useful, to many of us indispensable; and it is all very interesting. Just think for a moment of what one single volume of the multitude of entries from Abbey to Zymonidas has meant to the author—the conceiving of the book, the writing of it, the printing of it (in these days), the reception of it, the future of it. Or look at the variety of output—all the literary activities of mankind represented in all shades of opinion and performance. But this way lie too many mysteries.

Pass to the Comparative Table. How many books were published in 1919?—8622; in 1920?—11,004. It is a very substantial increase. But look again; 766 books in religion were published in 1919, only 679 in 1920. All the kinds are up but Religion and Education—the two that most deserve.

And now, last of all, thank the Editor for his patience and perseverance. He has something very like genius, if that is taking pains.

EDUCATION.

Is there a science of Education? Not yet. But there ought to be. And that there may be, Mr. James Clerk Maxwell Garnett, C.B.E., M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Dean of the Faculty of Technology in the Victoria University of Manchester, has written a book on *Education and World Citizenship* (Cambridge: at the University Press; royal 8vo, pp. x, 515; 36s. net).

What is wanting to make Education a science? A distinct aim, recognized principles, and a definite programme. And all these are furnished in this book, though the author modestly calls it 'an Essay towards a Science of Education.'

First, a distinct aim. What is the aim of Education? There is no agreement yet. Among recent pronouncements two are cited by Mr.

Garnett 'by way of illustration of the diversity of view that characterises the age in which we live. Sir William Ramsay, in the course of an article on English Education, refers to "the aim of training, namely, the power of concentration, the exercise of judgment, and, most of all, the development of the inventive faculties." Dr. C. A. Mercier also regards education as having a threefold aim. He writes: "The aims of education are, I take it, these three: It should inculcate first, character; second, a habit of clear thinking; and third, a knowledge of facts . . . it is better to be good than to be wise: it is better to be wise than to be learned.'" 'Professor Adams has enumerated some fifteen statements of the aim of education and concludes that "there are two . . . that stand out from the others as embodying all the essentials, and as between them covering the whole field. . . . The first is *self-realisation*, the second *many-sided interest*. These have been frequently treated as antagonistic ideals, and each has its enthusiastic supporters. But . . . far from opposing each other they are really complementary. Neither can be attained apart from the other.'" With that Mr. Garnett agrees. The aim of education then is 'interest in other men and things whereby one reaches the fullest attainment of selfhood.'

Secondly, principles. If there is chaos in the aim of Education, its principles are doubly formless and dark. 'When two expert chemists disagree before a court of law, not upon the validity of one of the generalisations which form the principles of their science, but merely upon the question whether a particular fact belongs to one generalisation or to another, their disagreement is sufficiently remarkable to excite comment. But, when the discussion is of education, disagreement concerning first principles is the rule rather than the exception. There is little agreement concerning the end of education, and still less concerning the means. Even the agreement that does appear to exist is often fictitious and due either to the misuse of metaphor or to the absence of any esoteric or symbolic language in which ideas concerning education can be unequivocally expressed. And yet the need for established principles of education and for the general recognition of such principles is beyond dispute. It is only by means of organised systems of ideas that our thinking, whether of education or of any other matter, can make permanent progress; and it is only by the wide

acceptance (which need not be other than provisional) of a single set of principles that a coherent and effective system of public education may be built up.' Mr. Garnett furnishes principles—that is the purpose of his writing.

Thirdly, a programme. In the programme or curriculum lies the originality and keenest interest of the book. Look at the matter from the side of the educationist. He has first of all to learn a little physiology. On the foundation of his physiology he erects his psychology, which he must know more thoroughly. On his psychology he builds his teaching. He takes into account the special aptitude of each pupil. Aptitude for what? For social service, or, in our author's phrase, for world citizenship. Every boy and every girl is to be trained for the special place in society which he or she is to fill. 'Thus, for example, the undergraduate course in engineering that is being followed by one who is about to enter the works in which, as a college apprentice, he is to continue his engineering training, should be concerned with the relation of engineering to human society (in overcoming material obstacles to human progress), and so to God. It must also include a study of the principles of mechanics, physics and other pure sciences that have been applied to engineering. That is to say, it should connect to one another and to the central purpose of the student's life—his purpose to serve God and man as an engineer—a number of essences that belong to different branches of the endarchy of science, and whose connexions in that endarchy may not have been completely discovered or, if they have, may have to be short-circuited in the engineer's scientific endarchy.'

How will the special gift be known? The boy or girl must be allowed much freedom of choice, assisted, however, by the teacher, and, in some cases of slow development, wholly directed. And *every* boy and *every* girl must have special training. So the curriculum covers a vast space of ground. Mr. Garnett gives it in a coloured plate. It begins with 'elementary' and ends with 'graduate and research.' There are on the diagram sixteen stages. Not all children are carried through all the stages: they drop out as they find their work. It is a great scheme: how is the money to be found for it? Mr. Garnett says the League of Nations will find it—find it in ten years' time, if you will only give the League your backing.

THE ORDER OF THE ARTS.

It is not easy in these days to provide readers with a sensation that is really sensational. The sensational editors are at their wits' end, and at the end of everything else. But Mr. A. Trystan Edwards, M.A., formerly Scholar of Hertford College, Oxford, Associate of the Royal Institute of British Architects and Associate Member of the Town Planning Institute, has done it. He has written a book with the title of *The Things which are Seen* (Allan; 18s. net), in which he assures us that Painting and Sculpture are the 'minor arts,' the great arts being Good Looks, Pleasant Manners, Fine Dress, and a Nice House.

Is it all nonsense? Well, no; there is a considerable peppering of sense in it. The Publishers, not undiscerning, have 'put their money on it,' and have sent it forth to the world furnished as fully and fairly as any art, major or minor, can furnish a book.

For one thing, Mr. Edwards riddles the saying 'Art for Art's sake.' You may just as wisely say 'Butter for Butter's sake.' No. Art is for our sake. And if it is not good for us it is not good for anything. Now the thing in art that is best for us is our own beauty—our own and our neighbours' good looks. So Mr. Edwards begins there. He ranges the arts in order of excellence. That is the most excellent art of all. 'It will help us,' he says, 'to measure the scope and significance of this art if we try to conceive the state of things which would arise if its claims were ignored. Imagine a society composed of citizens who were one and all devoted to painting and sculpture, who had inherited fine cities in which to live, who were exquisitely dressed and whose personal habits were without a fault. If these same citizens, however, owing to a culpable neglect of the means of physical development, were all extremely hideous, exhibiting every possible deformity of face and figure, would we not say that the best was lacking in such a community, that all its excellences could by no means atone for its one conspicuous defect? Contrast with this a society whose members cared little for elegance except the elegance of their own splendid selves, a society devoid of the secondary attributes of civilisation but still a pleasant place because it was the home of lovely children and superbly handsome men and women. It is obvious that the latter is not only the healthier of the two

but also the more clear-sighted. For all other sorts of beauty are as dross in comparison with the beauty of the human body, and an abhorrence of ugliness in men and women is a surer sign of an artistic nature than is the ability to criticise a picture or a building.'

Then follows, in order of excellence, the art of manners—good breeding. Its inferiority to good looks is proved by pointing out that good manners can be gained in a single generation, whereas 'it would require a tremendous effort, a great social will steadfastly exercised for hundreds of years, to make personal beauty a common thing.'

Third in order comes the art of dress. And after that the writer's own art—architecture. 'Even architects, who imagine that they are totally absorbed in their profession and who are accustomed to exalt its claims, would really far prefer to live in an ugly house than to go about with objectionable clothes; and they often show that, in spite of their devotion to architecture, they know less about it than they know about dress, for while their clothes are in the best of taste, the buildings for which they are responsible may be exceedingly vulgar.'

But why does Mr. Edwards separate painting and sculpture from the rest and call them the minor arts? The reason is that the other arts are expressed in terms of reality, they are only reflexions of reality. 'However much the painter may conventionalise a theme, however skilfully he may manipulate the elements of his picture in order to create a pattern, his work must always have an imitative character.'

When he has finished arranging the arts in the order of excellence, but half of his heavy task is done. He has still to deal with the nature of Form and with the Grammar of Design. And then, when all that is described and done with, he gives himself to the pleasant duty of describing the artist in society—the artist and the statesman, the artist and the engineer, right down to the artist and the metaphysician.

CHANCELLOR NEWBOLT.

The Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's, has written his autobiography. It is true that in the Preface, and in the very first sentence of it, he protests against our calling the book an autobiography. *Years that*

are Past is the title that he gives it (Wells Gardner; 12s. 6d. net). All the same it is an autobiography, or that word must be given a meaning unheard of. It is a modest autobiography. Canon Newbolt is in much fear lest the printer should run out of the letter I, and varies its use with expressions like 'the present writer.' It is modest to a fault. Canon Newbolt could easily have claimed more in the way of work done, and good work. There is one work especially which he has done, and done better than any other Canon in the Church. He has emphasized the value of preaching. He has spoken about it, and written about it, and he has himself persistently practised it. For this alone the Church of England owes him a debt of gratitude which may never be appreciated or paid.

Canon Newbolt's interest is in music and ritual. He had no theological training, none whatever. 'I received no professional preparation such as a year at a Theological College could give, and even the one short term which I had been allowed to look for at Cuddesdon had to be abandoned on account of a severe illness which threatened at one time to put off my Ordination.' And theology did not come to him by nature as the love of ritual did. He does not once discuss a theological question in this book, nor see it from afar. But he can write this about the special services in St. Paul's: 'There are also two other great acts of devotion in the year, as they may be called, Spohr's "Last Judgment," or Brahms's "Requiem," sung in Advent as a special act of devotion, and the wonderful Passion music of Bach in Holy Week, which in its deep religious setting and exquisite rendering is looked forward to by thousands, as a profound and solemn refreshment in that sacred season. Few who have heard it will ever forget the marvellous rendering of the treble solos by the whole boy-choir singing, as it were, with one voice, or the fierce rush of the dramatic choir narrative as, for instance, in the cry for Barabbas and in the terrible shout "Crucify Him." And most of all the heart is stirred by the solemn and profound hush for private prayer at the moment when the description of the Agony in Gethsemane is reached. It almost helps one to realise the mysterious words of the Apocalypse of St. John, "There was silence in heaven." This service has been kept up all through the War, and is eagerly looked for each year as Holy Week comes round.'

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

It is with particular pleasure that we receive a new historical work by Dr. Henry Osborn Taylor. His reputation is now well assured, and as well assured in Britain as in America. The new book carries on the history of Europe from the time when the previous book left it off. First there came *Ancient Ideals*, a Study of Intellectual and Spiritual Growth from Early Times to the Establishment of Christianity. This was followed by *The Medieval Mind*, a History of the Development of Thought and Emotion in the Middle Ages. The new book is entitled *Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century* (Macmillan; 2 vols., \$9 net).

There is the same recognition of principle, reserve of expression, and compass of scholarship in all Dr. Taylor's work. There is certainly no parade of scholarship: the footnotes are few and often obvious. But the scholarship is there, to the last item of value. The language is in no sense provincial; not even is the spelling peculiar to one country; the right word is found easily and the right sentence follows. Most important of all, the attention is never lost in blind alleys. That which is essential, whether in personality or in prophecy, is seen at once to be essential, making the history a great lesson-book for mankind. And in and through all there is the unseen but felt presence of the Most High.

Much of the present work is biographical. No doubt all history is biography. But in the sixteenth century, men were thrown up out of the mass more evidently than in less momentous times, and upon them—upon such men as Erasmus, Luther, Calvin—the less gifted men depended more than will ever again be possible in Europe. This fact demands a gift of swift characterization, which Dr. Taylor does not possess in any eminent degree. Yet it will be necessary to quote from his character sketches as the most accessible means of showing how his imagination goes to work. Let us take first a portion of what he says about Erasmus:

'The purposes, the opinions, the qualities of Erasmus reveal themselves in his works. These reflect his environment and his nature, making a very adequate self-expression of the man Erasmus; and the self-expression of a man is always true. Had Erasmus possessed the Titan nature of a

Luther, convulsed with convictions as violent as they were trenchant, his self-expression would have appealed to us more pointedly than it does from out the compass of those huge ten folios of the Leyden edition. His innumerable writings did their work in their time, and still interest us historically. They spread the Erasmian personality before us. He who may bring himself to read them will note everywhere facility of presentation, broad, proportioning scholarship, not too exact, nor always profound; balanced common sense and clear intelligence which grasp the veritable point; interest in well-authenticated fact, linguistic, historical and rational, which is the scholar's truth; care for what is truly ethical, dependent on motive and interest, and not bound up in ceremony and observance; insistence on unhampered study, on the rights of scholarship, on freedom to reach the most rationally verified result; recognition also of mutually tolerating differences of sensible opinion, but no patience for wilful ignorance and stubbornness; a cherishing of piety and rational religion, but with no taste for dogma or metaphysics, and as little for the transports of religious rapture.'

A good contrast, but also only a part of the whole picture, is this on Latimer:

'Latimer could not have been one of the greatest of all English preachers, had he been more of a systematic or logical or scientific theologian. The Bible is free, unsystematic and spontaneous. Its living current of religious inspiration cannot be made to flow through one who has immured his soul in logical definition and metaphysical formulation. At all events, not in the sixteenth century, which was not a century of constructive theological metaphysics, like the fourth, but one when the advancing energies of life, with their renewed evangelical and Biblical inspiration, were beating on the potent conjoined scheme of dogma and ecclesiastical authority. Latimer was impassioned with his own acceptance and understanding of the Bible. Affected, of course, by the thoughts and controversies of his era, he nevertheless drew his convictions from the Scriptures as spontaneously as he drew their illustration from the world about him. His sermons reflected and absorbed the habits, the demands, the hardships, the very implements and incidents of English life, all presented in the homely imagery and vigorous Anglo-Saxon that carried straight from the preacher to his audience. Here was indeed an English Gospeller,

whose thoughts and phrases seemed to echo Wyclif: "right prelating is busy labouring, and not lording," might have been Wyclif's or Latimer's. The latter was not from Wittenberg or Zurich or Geneva, but something of a Lollard preacher and bishop of the English Church.'

A PEOPLE'S LIFE OF CHRIST.

Forasmuch as, in our day, many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, it seems good to Professor Paterson-Smyth also to write *A People's Life of Christ* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). His qualifications are not more knowledge of the facts and their interpretation than many other men among us possess, but a singular sense of what will appeal to the multitude. It is claimed for him that he is the most popular religious writer of his time, and this *Life of Christ* is not in the least likely to diminish his popularity.

There is a style of writing on the New Testament which has come much into fashion recently. The fortunate possessor of it lets his fancy roam over the narratives, picking up here and there as it pleases, and plentifully embellishing what it picks up. Sometimes the fancy is so free that a new New Testament is the outcome. It is like the fascination which textual emendation has for some scholars. You can turn every word you come upon into 'Yerahmeel' if you please. Professor Paterson-Smyth has the gift, but he does not indulge it without measure.

'I can see'—this is after the words, 'Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world'—'I can see the two young fishermen starting down the path shyly, timidly, awkwardly, half hoping, half fearing that Jesus might speak to them. And Jesus, hearing the footsteps, turned round and beheld them following, as surely through all the ages He turns to timid disciples where He beholds them wishing to follow Him. Kindly, encouragingly He asks them, "What seek ye?" Perhaps He is testing them, making them ask their own hearts what they seek. He wants them to know. He does not mind ignorance, weakness, stupidity, anything, if only one can feel "I seek God. I seek service with Thee."

'The embarrassed young countrymen hardly know what to reply. "Master, where dwellest Thou?" Ah! Jesus knew what they wanted.

"Come with Me," He said, and He took them to His poor little lodging, and they abode with Him that day. John remembers so clearly, looking back over half a century. "It was about the tenth hour" (four o'clock). How could he ever forget? Think what it meant in the light of after-days to have been all that evening there alone with Jesus, sharing His simple hospitality, questioning Him, talking to Him easily and naturally, listening as He told them perhaps of His pain for men's troubles and sins, of His enthusiastic plans and hopes for this Kingdom of God. And, as His sympathy drew them out to talk shyly of their own aspirations, I feel sure that He said—it would be just like Him to say it—"One day I shall want you both to stand by Me and help." That is the sort of appeal that draws out the best in a man.

'Think of these two young men coming back that night under the starlight, their pulses stirring with wonder and enthusiasm, their hearts swelling with a great reverent affection for their new friend. "Aye, they would follow Him, follow Him to the death!" The whole world was changed for them that night. Earth was never the same again.'

HEGEL'S LOGIC.

Mr. Francis Sedlák undertook some time ago to translate into English Hegel's *Wissenschaft der Logik*. But he could not arouse interest in it. Then the thought came to him that better than a word-for-word translation might be a free paraphrase of Hegel's meaning. But what did that involve? It involved doing over again for himself the work which Hegel had done. The thought and what it involved both came to him in the reading of this paragraph in Lord Haldane's *Pathway to Reality*: 'You cannot stand still by the side of any one personality, however great. You must try, however inadequately, to do the work over again for yourself, and thus, notwithstanding the debt which the world owes to Hegel, we have each of us in this generation to try, if we would comprehend the true meaning of his teaching, to think it all for ourselves, in the light he has given us, but still for ourselves. Otherwise we should not really make any progress.'

He saw that 'to cease to adhere to the literal context of the original, means to do the work over again; and in that case the original author must not be made responsible for a possible deviation

from his own meaning. So comes it that my primary intention of simply paraphrasing Hegel's Great Logic converted itself finally into the present work.'

This, then, is the first volume, not of a translation, but of an interpretation, of Hegel's Logic. And this much can be said of it at once, that it is readable. Was there ever a worse writer than Hegel? We know all about his difficulties, the necessity of creating a new language and all that. But he created half his difficulties along with his language, and he simply could not write. Mr. Sedlák can write.

Does he represent his author or does he misrepresent him? He has at any rate read him. He has also read round about him. He is quite familiar with the last word that has been spoken respecting him. We think he represents him. The title is *Pure Thought and the Riddle of the Universe* (Allen & Unwin; 18s. net).

DIVINE IMAGINING.

Mr. Douglas Fawcett has written a supplement to his book 'The World as Imagination.' He calls it *Divine Imagining* (Macmillan; 15s. net). His purpose is to furnish a solution of the riddle of existence which shall be more acceptable than materialism, or idealism, or any other ism yet propounded. He tells us that he prefers the word 'Imagining' now to the word 'Imagination.' What the solution is we have already tried to make known. Now, however, we are able to test it by some of its results. He calls it 'Divine Imagining'—well, what sort of Divinity does he offer? This is the answer: 'We will reserve the term "God" for the supreme society of sentient which constitutes the greatest conscious power of this world-system. There is one such power for every mature or maturing world-system. It is not a single experient, but a "coalesced existence," as Sir Edwin Arnold would have said. But in other respects it fills the place in the system of the finite or limited God argued for by John Stuart Mill, William James, F. C. S. Schiller, R. H. Dotterer, and others, and is thus the "invisible King" of H. G. Wells. If there are, as we believe, innumerable world-systems, there are also innumerable such Kings, but none so potent as to command all the conditions that compass Him about. The actual occurrences of life suggest or show that He

is a struggler or striver who cannot mould everything after His desires. This planet, for instance, is a place of foulness and filthiness, of which no power, worthy of being called divine, can be the all-sufficient source and support. We have seen *why* it is so foul. In God we recognize a great agency which is helping, perhaps against many gods, to make it better. He is not all-powerful, not, perhaps, as regards even His own world-system, all-wise; just the highest expression of the conscious life which obtains within the system which is His body. And, like all sane sentient powers connected with a body, He is concerned for its excellence, as also for that of the subordinate sentient which are active in it. He is engaged, as Bernard Shaw suggests, "in a great struggle to produce something higher and better" within His province. And this province? It is that of the content-whole which we discussed as the Grand Imaginal: the primitively segregated whole which buds off from Divine Imagining: Blake's "dis-organized immortal" passing into temporary conflicts that it may be the generating-place and nursery of sentient. As the Grand Sentient God might be called the Child of Divine Imagining: but we must not use metaphor in a spirit of compromise with vulgar faith. The resemblance between the evolution of God and the genesis of a human child is not a close one.'

In publishing a criticism of Bergson's philosophy, Professor Ralph Tyler Flewelling, of the University of Southern California, has taken the opportunity of publishing also an account of that philosophy with which his name is so honourably associated, Personal Realism. The volume has accordingly the title: *Bergson and Personal Realism* (Abingdon Press; \$2 net).

Both parts of the book are well written. Personal Idealism, called by the late Professor Bowne, its founder, simply Personalism, is shown quite manifestly to have one advantage over the Philosophy of Change—the place it finds for and the emphasis it places upon *personality*. And just this is the sting of the criticism of Bergson. 'For it is readily seen that, apart from personality, freedom can possess no meaning.' A testing case is the doctrine of immortality. Bergson has no such doctrine. 'This will to some minds seem quite

unimportant, to others it will appear a grave defect in any system of philosophy. Our own feeling is that, aside from the demands of religious faith, there is a certain pragmatic demand which insists that philosophy shall at least not be inimical to the claims for personal immortality. Usually, that which is a universal demand of the human spirit will be found to reach root deeply into reality and life. This demand will increase if we assume that personality is necessary to all duration. If there be no personality in the creative "elan," we can have neither progress nor intelligibility in the universe, and it might be that the preservation of those personalities which are the feebler and lesser lights of itself would be the supreme demand in its experience of duration. If human personality has any light to throw upon the problem it is all in this direction. The supreme interests of our own duration cluster about other personalities which are bound to us by one tie or another. Certain it is that when these relations are broken we are filled with a sense of the futility and emptiness of life. The intensity of this feeling has been profoundly expressed in the poem of an Indian woman:

Lamp of my life, the lips of Death
Have blown thee out with their sudden breath;
Naught shall revive thy vanished spark . . .
Love, must I dwell in the living dark?

Tree of my life, Death's cruel foot
Hath crushed thee down to thy hidden root;
Naught shall restore thy glory fled . . .
Shall the blossom live when the soul is dead?

Life of my life, Death's bitter sword
Hath severed us like a broken word,
Rent us in twain who are but one . . .
Shall the flesh survive when the soul is gone?

Under the title of *In Touch with God*, the Rev. Joseph Sunn has published a small book on Meditation, or Mental Prayer as he prefers to call it (Burns Oates & Washbourne; 1s. net). It gives both the theory and the practice.

Messrs. Burns Oates & Washbourne have published 'A Catholic's Criticism of the *Outline of History*.' The title is *Some Errors of H. G. Wells* (1s. net). The author is the Rev. Richard Downey,

D.D. Mr. Wells should take time to read it before he issues the next edition of the *Outline*. But then perhaps he would not issue another edition.

Two useful volumes of *Readings in English Social History from Contemporary Literature* have been issued by the Cambridge University Press (4s. net each). The first volume begins in pre-Roman days—with Strabo and Diodorus Siculus—and ends in 1272; the second carries the story down to 1485. The editor is R. B. Morgan, M.Litt., Inspector of Schools to the Croydon Education Committee.

The Gospel according to Thomas (Daniel; 3s. net) is not an apocryphal book newly discovered. It is the Gospel according to Will Hayes. The Gospel narratives are given and the teaching of Jesus, but all supernaturalism is left out. Thus: 'And straightway coming up out of the water, he went into the wilderness to think of those things which he had heard and seen.' But to attribute such a gospel to Thomas is a curious misfit—to Thomas who first of all the disciples made the great supernatural affirmation, 'My Lord and my God'!

A book on *Patriotism* (Daniel; 6s. net) is a timely book. What else do we more urgently need to be instructed upon? And the time for instruction may pass. Mr. E. K. Fallowfield has the right way of it and can write forcibly. One thing, however, bothers him and us. Evidently he is anti-Christian. He is ready to give William Wilberforce credit for patriotism, in his efforts to abolish the slave-trade. But 'Wilberforce's activities were limited by his being a Christian first and then a man, that is, a man of the right kind—kind-hearted, sympathetic towards the suffering of others, liberal in mind, aware of his own short-comings and tolerant in respect of those of others. His claim to be considered a true patriot was spoiled by the possession of that hard, cruel disposition of the relentless, not to say ruthless, Christian who can brook no opposition; who demands that in religious matters all shall see eye to eye with him; and considers anyone, particularly if badly dressed, who has opinions of his own, equal to a criminal, and it only right that he should be treated as such.' It is clearly an obsession, and has to be discounted right through the book.

Mr. Joseph Conrad is an acceptable writer of essays. The Reviews and even the Daily Newspapers gladly publish them. A discerning public will as gladly receive them in the volume into which he has gathered six-and-twenty. Half are on 'Letters' and half on 'Life.' The title is *Notes on Life and Letters* (Dent; 9s. net).

The essays on Letters are a wonder for a man who for twenty years spent his life at sea, as seaman, mate, and master. They are no amateur's work. How did he find the books that fitted him for a critical estimate of Henry James, Alphonse Daudet, Anatole France, and Turgenev? But the essays on 'Life' come home to us most assuredly. Even when his subject is 'The Loss of the *Titanic*,' after all that we have read about that disaster, and in spite of the more recent and more awful sinking of the *Lusitania*, even then we read Mr. Conrad's story with strong feeling. 'What has become of his suggestion that great ships should carry cork-fenders? 'One of them (he is speaking now of the loss of the *Empress of Ireland*), hung judiciously over the side at the end of its lanyard by a man who knew what he was about, might perhaps have saved from destruction the ship and upwards of a thousand lives.'

Messrs. Herder of 68 Great Russell Street have issued an edition of Genesis in Hebrew and Vulgate Latin. *Liber Geneseos: Textum Hebraicum Emendavit Latinum Vulgatum Addidit Godofredus Hoberg, Philosophiæ et Theologiæ Doctor Professor P.O. in Universitate Friburgensi Br.* (3s. 6d. net).

Three volumes in theology written by the Rev. Oscar L. Joseph, B.D., have reached us together. They follow one another in experience. First comes our knowledge of *The Faith and the Fellowship*. Then comes the duty of making the Faith known to others by our knowledge of the *Essentials of Evangelism*. And then comes the thought of the End or *The Coming Day*. The volumes are published in this country by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (\$1.25 net each).

The volume on the Faith is introduced by Dr. S. Parker Cadman, who says: 'Mr. Joseph has enjoyed special advantages which are herein displayed. He hails from the foreign and non-Christian world, where he witnessed the problems and the victories of missionary effort. The great

literary productions of Hindu and Buddhist faith and practice are contrasted with the operations of the teachings of the New Testament. Indeed, the book casts a welcome light on the study of comparative religion. The author's residence in the British Empire and in our own Republic has given him a conception of Christian obligation which to be felt aright must be experienced at first hand, and which arises from actual contact with the realms we propose to conquer for the Kingdom of our Master. This sense of obligation prevails throughout his book and lends weight to its conclusions.'

Let us test his belief and his power of expressing it by a quotation from that volume. The test is a keen one.

'So many-sided is the character of Christ that we can regard Him in several ways and honour Him for the opulence of His grace. But let us be careful that we do not confuse any partial aspects, however valuable, with that which is central and vitally supreme. A Christianity which holds up Christ as a Pattern, however symmetrical and complete in character; or which exalts Him as a martyr even though the noblest of them all; or which praises Him as a moralist of exceptionally high and exacting ethical standards; or which honours Him as a teacher with charm, wisdom, and authority—a Christianity which does only these things appeals to the world as a humanitarian system, the best of its kind; but it falls far short of being the religion of full and far-reaching redemption. It is lacking in the Divine afflatus which has given holy courage, irresistible energy, the swing of conquest, and the experience of achievement so characteristic of those who have accepted the Divine-human Christ of the entire New Testament testimony. The lesser message has always proved to be ineffectual. It has no word of cheer to the despondent, nor of peace to the disconsolate, nor of pardon to the distracted. The soul which has been lashed by sin and whose life has been scarred by evil passions and which is suffering from moral anæmia and a paralysed will surely needs something far more dynamic than wise counsels, gracious ideas, or beautiful sentiments. This necessary divine energy is obtained by men not at Bethlehem which tells of the Incarnation of Christ, nor at Capernaum which reminds us of His teaching, nor on Mt. Tabor which holds us in confusion as we witness the Transfiguration,

but at Calvary, where the bleeding heart of the Son of God can stay our wounds and heal our sorrows and strengthen our purposes of righteousness and enable us to translate them into deeds which breathe the spirit of liberty, equality and fraternity, raised to the highest power. This experience is not only that of the first century; it belongs to all the Christian centuries. If we take the time to listen we can hear a vast multitude whom no man can number, speaking in their several languages and dialects, rejoicing in the knowledge that they have been brought out of darkness into light by the merits of Christ's redemption.'

Then as a test of his scholarship and his attitude on the Second Coming, take this from the third volume: 'Jesus Christ is the Coming One, but we regard his coming as progressive and not to be confined to any single event. This is really the teaching of the Scriptures, when taken in all their bearings and connections. The Book of Revelation opens with the declaration, "Behold he cometh." The verb is in the "progressive present," which "denotes action in progress." The sentence may then be translated, "Behold, he is coming." The seer beheld "the holy city Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God." It was in process of descent and its career has not yet ended, and will not until "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.'"

Mr. Vachel Lindsay, the American poet, is also a prose writer. He has published books of verse and he has published books of prose, and an equal number of both. No; the new book makes the prose production one up. It is 'the review of a book that will appear in the autumn of the year 2018, and an extended description of Springfield, Illinois, in that year.' Its title is *The Golden Book of Springfield* (Macmillan).

It begins in this way: 'There is a woman who is florist of our town, Anne Morrison, a descendant of the Chapman family. She holds in special reverence John Chapman (Johnny Appleseed), who began his labors in a region a little north of Alexander Campbell's diocese, in the Ohio basin. He remains a tradition among the more northern group of those who worshipped Campbell, and among similar pioneers. He is especially honoured by that splendid sect, the Swedenborgians, for he was a preacher and teacher of the doctrines of

Swedenborg. But he was even more notably a nurseryman. He was deserving of the laurels of Thoreau, three times and more, and by the test of life rather than writing, to him belongs nearly every worth-while crown of Whitman. He skirmished on the very edge of the frontier, but fought the wilderness, not the Indian. The aborigines thought him a great medicine man and holy man, because of his magical bag of seeds, for along their trails, wherever he tramped, there soon came up pennyroyal and all beneficent herbs. With the tenderness of St. Francis he wept over every wounded bird, and with the steadiness of a nation builder, he planted orchards of apples in the openings of the forest, fenced them in, and left them for the pioneers to find, long after. He wore for a shirt and sole article of clothing an old gunny-sack with holes cut for arms and legs, and winter or summer slept in the hollow tree on the pile of old leaves, and weathered it past seventy years, while the great Whitman lived in houses, and Thoreau was on Walden but a season or two. These men left behind them certain writings, but Johnny Appleseed left behind him apples, orchards heavy with fruit, beauty from the very black earth, and a tradition whose wonder shall yet ring through all the palaces of mankind. He was swift as the deer, and gentle as the fawn—and stern with himself, as the Red Indian. Like Christ and Socrates he wrote only in the soil. He was welcomed more like an angel than a man in the pioneer cabins, and if ever there was an American saint left uncanonized in 1920, it is John Chapman, Johnny Appleseed, and by 2018 he is canonized indeed, and has his niche in the Springfield Cathedral, according to Anne Morrison's revelation.'

The story of Johnny Appleseed is a true story. And in the book truth is the aim always, and historic truth; but not of the past as this, rather of the far future. But of course it is not for that yet to come generation that Mr. Lindsay writes: it is for us. What will his book do for us? It will give us pleasure at any rate: profit also if we will to profit by it.

Messrs. Pitman have under issue in fortnightly parts (2s. net) *The Encyclopædia and Dictionary of Education*, edited by Professor Foster Watson, M.A., D.Litt. Each part contains 64 pages in double column, so that the whole work in 31 parts will run to nearly 2000 pages. A large number of

authors are engaged upon the articles, over 800 as we reckon. The articles are generally short, the idea being to furnish a starting-point and stimulus rather than an exhaustive description of the subject. Being short they are very numerous. Some of them are no more than definitions, as—

‘ALERTNESS [Italian, *alPerta* (on the watch)].—Readiness to observe, to grasp facts, and to use them.’
 ‘ALGOMETER (measure of pain).—An instrument used to test the sensitiveness of the skin to pain by means of the pressure of a blunt point.’

Photographic illustrations in plate paper are a prominent feature. They are mostly of modern educational buildings. There is an air-photo of Marischal College, Aberdeen.

In the Devotional Commentary, edited by the Rev. A. R. Buckland, M.A., and published by the Religious Tract Society, *The Gospel according to Mark* occupies four volumes. And that is good news. For the editor of St. Mark is the Rev. J. D. Jones, D.D., of Bournemouth. The fourth volume is of a fullness of thought and fitness of language rarely even attempted in a commentary. And then it is so experimental. It is the experience of J. D. Jones, yes, and of every one else who has tasted and seen how gracious the Lord is.

To your ‘Texts for Students’ add: (1) *The Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians*, by T. W. Crafer, D.D.; (2) *Babylonian Flood Stories*; and (3) *Babylonian Penitential Psalms*, both by Percy Handcock, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 6d. net each).

The latest lectureship is the Pilkington. And the first Pilkington lecturer is the Rev. J. R. Darbyshire, Canon of Manchester. It is a lectureship in Christian evidence. So Canon Darbyshire chose for subject *The Christian Faith and Some Alternatives* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net), the Alternatives being Christian Science, Theosophy, and Spiritualism. It is a fair-minded, sympathetic, short exposition of these three forms of belief, and yet amounts to exposure. For in each of them the element of insincerity is so pervading as to become imposture. But to what is their popularity due? To the facts of pain, sin, and death. And to these facts Canon Darbyshire addresses himself, saying really helpful things after all that has been said.

‘Give my love to A. P. B., and tell him I’ll fight the Germans with him when the time comes whatever—but expect to be beat. Their civilization is barbarism, their learning a sin against nature, and their religion rank atheism, but as machines they’re gorgeous and colossal.’

That in a letter from Marburg in 1909. Leslie Johnston had gone to study there. So when the time came he was not taken by surprise. A scholar—Dean of Magdalen College, Oxford, at the time—he joined up at once, and on May 11, 1915, disappeared. He was known to have been hit: no more was known.

A Memoir of Leslie Johnston has been written by Edwyn Bevan, M.A., Hon. Fellow of New College, Oxford (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net). The impression made is of one who, without ever getting over doubt, gave himself with energy (he did everything energetically) to the bringing of men to Christ. Writing at one of the Student Christian conferences, he says: ‘Also we had a most puzzling testimony from one Donald Fraser, one of the earlier Students of the Movement, about his own conversion, which gave to think, as such things always do. Quite certainly, as Neville said, we have never been converted in that sense of the word—the only question is whether we have in any other.’ Few men have been able to get alongside the undergraduate as he did; and it cost him something. His aversion was the ‘modern churchman.’

There is considerable interest for the non-Quaker in *Quaker Aspects of Truth*, by E. Vipont Brown, M.D. (Swarthmore Press; 5s. net). It is so frank; it is so human; it is so loyally Quaker. Where lies its strength? In the fruits of Quakerism to which it can modestly turn our attention. ‘How does the Society of Friends stand this test? Has it produced men and women of sterling character and integrity? Good parents, good neighbours, good citizens, good patriots, in the best sense of the word? Have its members shown themselves ready and willing to sacrifice self-interest for the common weal? Have their lives borne witness to a full and practical recognition of the deep and wide obligations of a universal brotherhood?’ That is strength indeed. Where lies its weakness? In a certain hesitation as to belief. At first the father of the Prodigal Son seems to be accepted as God enough. But then

come the facts of life. 'I well remember some twenty years ago witnessing the death of a man in good position in society who took his own life. At the time he was supposed to have been wealthy, but in reality he had got into financial difficulties; and, in order to extricate himself from them, he acted in a way that was far from honourable; and then, rather than face the consequences of what he had done, he committed suicide, leaving his wife and children to fight the battle of life alone. I shall never forget the terrible scene which followed. It is written indelibly on my memory, and I well remember that, as we talked the matter over afterwards, we anticipated the most disastrous consequences for the children. But as soon as the first shock of the terrible calamity was over, the mother set to work to make a living for her children. Though she had been brought up in the lap of luxury, and had scarcely known what

it was to do a hard day's work, she started dress-making, and took in lodgers, and by working day and night she succeeded in giving the children a good education. What she suffered it is impossible for us to realize, but by her sufferings she saved her children from degradation, and turned them out into the world useful and self-respecting citizens. I used to know them well, and was proud to know them. Here, then, we have an example of vicarious suffering—the innocent suffering for the guilty—the mother suffering for the father's sin. But not only was it vicarious suffering: it was obviously vicarious suffering which had in it no small measure of atoning efficacy. By the mother's sacrifice the children were saved from ruin and were made useful and self-respecting citizens. The harmony, jeopardised by sin, was in a large measure restored.'

A Message from Malachi.

BY THE REVEREND DUNCAN CAMERON, B.D., DIRECTOR OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION,
MORAY HOUSE, EDINBURGH.

'Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another: and the Lord hearkened, and heard it; and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name. And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him.'—Mal 3^{16, 17}.

THE whole passage of the third chapter of Malachi in which these words occur is well known to the average reader of the Bible, but the interpretation that is usually given is not satisfactory. Principal Sir George Adam Smith in his great commentary on *The Book of the Twelve Prophets* takes this passage as referring to the 'doubters among the pious remnant of Israel.' They had come to say that it was vain to serve God. They were forgetful of the teaching of the prophets about the value of righteous suffering. Principal Smith says that Malachi's message 'is that the Lord remembers them, has their names written before Him, and when the day of His action comes, they shall be separated from the wicked, and spared.'

An explanation along the same line is given

by Professor J. E. McFadyen of Glasgow in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES* for February of this year. He says that Judaism in the post-exilic age had a note of intellectual challenge, and he takes the passage in Malachi as illustrating his contention that by the time of Malachi (5th cent. B.C.) scepticism was common. He says that the Book of Malachi unmistakably 'reveals an atmosphere of discussion and challenge even among the circle of the pious.' He goes on to say that the prophet assures them that 'God is writing their names in a book which will keep Him in mind, in the great day, of their fidelity.'

The key to the interpretation of 'this striking passage in the Book of Malachi lies in the meaning of the phrases 'they that feared the Lord,' 'a book of remembrance,' and 'when I make up my jewels.'

A strong case can be made out for the view that the phrase 'they that feared the Lord' refers to proselytes, to those who had not been born into the family of the Israelites but had accepted the faith of Israel. There are passages in the Old

Testament in which it is best to interpret the phrase as referring to Israelites, but in this passage in Malachi and in other parts of the Bible it is best interpreted as referring to proselytes. In some Latin inscriptions a proselyte is called *metuens*, 'one fearing.' Schürer says that the phrase 'those that fear the most High God' designates associations of Greeks in the first Christian centuries, who had taken their name and their monotheistic faith from the Jew, but still retained many of the elements of Greek life and religion. Poppæa Sabina, the wife of Nero, was attracted by Judaism, and is called by Josephus a 'God-fearer.' In this connexion it is worth noting that Cornelius is described in the Acts of the Apostles as 'a devout man, and one that feared God.'

If we take the phrase 'ye that fear the Lord' to mean 'proselytes,' then the words in Ps 115⁹⁻¹¹ are a call to three classes in the community of Israel—the priests, the Israelites outside the priesthood, and the proselytes. The same three classes are mentioned in the words that follow: 'He will bless the house of Israel. He will bless the house of Aaron. He will bless them that fear the Lord.' We take it, then, that it is possible that the passage in Malachi refers to the proselytes, and not to the doubters among the pious remnant of Israel.

The second phrase that furnishes a key to the interpretation of the passage in Malachi is 'a book of remembrance.' 'A book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord.' The Hebrew word translated by 'before him' frequently means 'in the sanctuary.' Thus we read in the Book of Exodus how the Israelites were fed with manna in the wilderness, and Moses gave the order to put an 'omer of manna' in a pot, and to lay it up 'before the Lord.' Aaron, obeying the order, laid it up 'before the testimony' (chap. 16). So also Moses laid the rods 'before the Lord' in the tabernacle (Nu 17), and Samuel 'told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord' (1 S 10²⁵).

It is likely that the book of remembrance referred to was a book that was laid up in the Temple. It is called a 'book of remembrance' Now the word translated 'remembrance' here is used in a passage in Nehemiah which throws some light on the message in Malachi. Nehemiah says to Sanballat and Tobiah, who were treating him with scorn: 'Ye have no portion, nor right, nor

memorial in Jerusalem' (Neh 2²⁰). The word translated 'memorial' or 'remembrance' refers to proofs of citizenship, and suggests records in which the names of Israelitish families were recorded.

As a matter of fact, we read of records of this kind. At the beginning of the story of his own life, Josephus says: 'I have set down the genealogy of my family as I have found it described in the public records.' We read in the Talmud about a tribunal of the Sanhedrim which judged regarding the purity of the descent of Priests and Levites. The members of this body are called in the Talmud 'examiners of the genealogies of Priests and Levites.' This tribunal met in the Temple, and we may infer that the genealogies were kept in the Temple. There was also a record of Israelitish families of pure descent outside the priesthood. It became necessary to have another register, the register of proselytes, those who had joined the community of Israel. Eusebius speaks of these records in the first book of his History, and says that Herod burned them. A Zadokite fragment was published recently by a well-known scholar. It dates from the time the Temple was in existence, and tells of the custom of registering the people in four groups—priests, Levites, Israelites, and 'ger,' the last class being proselytes.

'When I make up my jewels.' The Hebrew word translated 'my jewels' is used several times in the Bible, but it is only in this passage in Malachi that it is translated 'jewels.' It is usually translated 'peculiar treasure,' as in the words 'Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people' (Ex 19). And in the margin of the Bible the translation in Malachi is 'special treasure.' We might translate the words in Malachi, 'And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I take stock of my property.'

Interpreting the three phrases in this way, the meaning of the passage in Malachi is clear. It is not that the pious remnant of Israel have become doubters. The proselytes were being told that there was no hope for them. They were beginning to think that their faith in God was in vain. The wicked among those who were Israelites by birth were classed higher than those who were proselytes and sought to serve God. They that feared the Lord—the proselytes—spoke often together about this, and the prophet's message is that God heard and recognized their right to citizenship in Israel.

A book of remembrance was written and laid in the Temple. Their names were enrolled in a register, and on the day when Jehovah took stock of His property, He would regard them as His.

The prophet is not only encouraging the proselytes; he is also condemning the spirit which led men to think that no matter how a man sought to serve God, his service was vain if he was not an Israelite; and the Israelite would be safe even in

his godlessness. Over against this the prophet teaches that God regards all who serve Him as a part of His property, His peculiar treasure. The true distinction to be drawn is not between the Israelite and the non-Israelite, but between the righteous and the wicked. The difference that really counts is 'between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not.'

The Dynasties of Sumer and Akkad.

By S. LANGDON, M.A., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

EARLY Babylonian chronology is being slowly but surely established by means of cuneiform records. The subject excites peculiar interest, not only because it is the framework of the history of a great civilization, but because of its direct bearing upon the traditional chronology of the Old Testament. The Nippur collection in Philadelphia has furnished most of the material for the reconstruction of the legendary and authentic dynasties from the Flood to the period of the kings of Isin (2357-2132 B.C.). The most remarkable tablet was found by Dr. Poebel in 1913, and published as No. 2 of his *Historical and Grammatical Texts* (1914). This large tablet carried six columns of about forty lines each on both obverse and reverse. Only about one-quarter of the text is preserved. Written in the reign of the eleventh king of Isin, about the middle of the 23rd century, it preserved the historical reconstruction of the scholars of the great temple school at Nippur. From the Flood to the period of writing eleven different cities had been the seats of Sumerian or Semitic kings. Kish, in Akkad, near Babylon, had been the capitol four times; Erech, in Sumer, five times; Ur, in Sumer, three times; and the following cities were each the capitol of Sumer and Akkad, once in the long period of the conflict between Sumerian and Semite: Awan (or Awak), east of the Tigris; Hamazi, in the same region; Adab, in Sumer; Ma-er, an old Sumerian settlement on the middle Euphrates and later an Amorite capitol; Akšak, later called Opis, on the Tigris at the mouth of the river Adhem; Agade, near Sippar; Gutium (a land); and Isin, of unknown location, on the Euphrates

north of Nippur. The names of these eleven cities have been restored by a remarkable discovery just published by Dr. Legrain, Curator of the Babylonian Collection in the University Museum, Philadelphia. He has found a fragment from the upper middle section of a six-column tablet duplicate of the Poebel tablet with many peculiarities of its own. A good photograph and translation have been given in the *Museum Journal*, December 1920, a copy of which reached me this day (January 18). The photograph is so excellent that one is able to control the translation and to make an estimate of the lost portions, so that Babylonian chronology can now be reconstructed with small margin of uncertainty back to a period considerably before 4000.

The Poebel tablet begins with two long legendary dynasties, the first at Kish, which was Semitic, and the second at Erech, which was Sumerian. The names of the kings are incomplete. The years of the reigns vary from 1200 to 100 years. These fabulous reigns belong to the era of legend, but they cannot be dismissed entirely from real history. The third post-diluvian kingdom was again Sumerian, and ruled at Ur. It contained only four kings, and the names of the last two, which were defective on the larger tablet, are restored by the new tablet. Then followed a dynasty at Awan of three kings. Their names are broken from both tablets. It is obvious that the next dynasty returned to Ur, since the only place left for the insertion of the second of the three kingdoms of Ur is at the end of column 1 on the Legrain tablet. It contained four kings who ruled 108

years, as we know from the totals on a dynastic list. The new tablet has the astounding statement that the kingdom was now obtained by Kish, where six kings ruled 3792 years. It had been supposed that the first kingdom of Ur, to which the chroniclers assigned four kings and the modest total of 171 years, belonged to authentic history. But here comes a later kingdom with six kings whose reigns average more than 600 years. The photograph shows that Legrain's reading is correct. The three kings of Awan reigned 356 years.

The new tablet places the kingdom of Hamazi after this long kingdom of Kish. It had but one king whose name ended in . . . *mi-iš*, and the Poebel tablet assigns only 7 years to his reign.¹ The period of authentic history has now been reached, and it is disturbing to find the fabulous figures 3792 years assigned to the preceding kingdom of Kish. There is obviously something wrong about the scribe's addition of the figures for the six kings of the second Kish dynasty. Amazing errors of this kind recur in chronological tablets, and it may well be that the sign for 3600 should be suppressed, leaving 192 years for this period. All available dynastic tablets for the reconstruction of the dynasty which succeeded Hamazi fail us at this point. Here I place the third dynasty of Kish, to which belonged the kings Mesilim, Urzaged, Lugaltarsi, and Enbi-Ašdar, reconstructed in my *History of Sumer* (in press) from the inscriptions. The next dynasty would be the second kingdom of Erech, to which belong Enšagkušanna, Lugalkigubnidudu, and Lugalkisalsi. Legrain's tablet at the end of Obverse II. and at the top of Obverse III. is to be restored by these two kingdoms. We now reach the kingdom of Adab on this tablet, which states that it consisted of only one king, Lugal-anni-mundu.² The tablet assigns 90 years to his reign. Here the chronicler's inaccuracy can be proven, for the inscriptions from Adab mention at least two more kings, Lugaldalu and Mebasi. The probability is that the scribe knew the length of the dynasty but

not all of its kings, and assigned the whole period to one. Lugalannimundu is the only king of Adab yet found on Nippur tablets.

The new tablet contains the surprising entry of a dynasty at Ma-er, which followed on that of Adab. The statuette of an old Sumerian king of Ma-er named [. . .] Babbar was already known. The tablet has the name of the founder of this kingdom, *Dingir-gid* and his son [. . .] *gi*, and I estimate that the tablet could spare space for about four kings of Ma-er. They appear to have been Sumerians, and not until the age of Sargon of Agade do Semitic names appear at Ma-er. The tablet now continued with the kingdom of Akšak, re-named Opis in Cassite times. The names and the terms of the six kings of Akšak are known from the important dynastic tablet published by Scheil, which begins here. Legrain's tablet agrees with the Scheil tablet in assigning 99 years to the period. Both tablets make the fourth Kish dynasty the successor of the Akšak kingdom. Scheil's tablet has an incredible entry about a woman wine merchant, Azag-Bau, who is said to have made secure the foundation of Kish, and to have reigned 100 years! But the Legrain tablet, with more probability, has it that Puzur-Sin, the son of Azag-Bau, was the first king, and ruled 25 years. The Scheil tablet makes Puzur-Sin the second ruler, and also assigns 25 years to him. To Ur-Ilbaba, the next king, the Scheil tablet assigns 6 years, and the new chronicle apparently 80! where it breaks away. The 100 years assigned to the queen Azag-Bau are not entirely mythical. An omen text says that 'she ruled the land,' and she is placed by later chronologists among the famous rulers of early times. It is certain that a very long period must be assigned to her either as a real ruler or as queen-regent. From the new tablet it is to be inferred that she was queen-regent, and that the 100 years assigned to her must partially drop out of our chronology. Scheil's tablet, including her as a ruler, gives eight kings for the fourth Kish dynasty, and 586 years as the total, whereas the total of the terms actually given is only 192, and that includes the doubtful 100 of Azag-Bau. The Legrain tablet makes up for lost figures by increasing 6 to 80(?) for Ur-Ilbaba, but it then breaks away, and we are abandoned to conjecture. I suggest that 192 years be regarded as the actual duration of this period, that Azag-Bau was queen-regent for her son and grandson, and that she

¹ This statement depends upon whether my conjecture for the last sign of Poebel, No. 2, Rev. II., is correct. I propose to read *šag Ha-ma-zi* in that passage. The whole passage would then read: 'Altogether one king, he ruled seven years. Once in Hamazi.'

² On two duplicate inscriptions the name is written *Lugal-an-ni-mu-un-du*, Poebel, *B.E.* vi.² No. 130, Obv. 2, and *Lugal-an-na-mu-un-dū*, *P.B.S.* v. 75, col. i. 3.

actually ruled for a short time at the beginning of the kingdom.

We now come to the most important contribution concerning the problem of early chronology. Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, repeatedly states that Narām-Sin was the son of Sargon, and reigned 3200 years before 553 B.C., or 3753 B.C. All the kingdoms which we have been reviewing preceded the kingdom of Agade, founded by Sargon, who began to reign nearly a century before Narām-Sin. Sargon would then be placed about 3850 B.C., and it would be possible to retrace actual history by dead reckoning back to 6000 B.C. Nabonidus has been generally discredited alike by archaeology, epigraphy, and contemporaneous records. Bricks of Sargon and Narām-Sin are found at Adab and Nippur, almost immediately below the pavements of Ur-Engur (2474). The measurements of the Legrain tablet prove that there is just enough space between the end of Reverse III., where the Gutium kingdom (successor of the kingdom of Agade) ends, and the fragmentary lines of Reverse IV. (dynasty of Isin), to place the lost fifth kingdom of Erech and the four kings of the last kingdom of Ur. It is wholly impossible to account for a break of 1000 years between Gutium and Isin at the end of Reverse III. and the top of Reverse IV., where the Isin dynasty begins. The size of this tablet is fixed not only by comparison with the Poebel tablet, but by those breaks which can be filled in from reliable sources. Nabonidus is definitely discredited and charged with an error of 1000 years.

After the fourth kingdom of Kish, followed the third kingdom of Erech, with one king, Lugalzaggisi, who falls in the break at the top of Reverse I. on the Legrain tablet. We now learn that the famous Sargon of Agade was originally a cup-bearer of Ur-Ilbaba, who reigned 79 years before Sargon at Kish. The probability is that Ur-Ilbaba had been deified, and that Sargon served in this cult at Kish in his youth. The office of cup-bearer was purely a religious one, wherefore we are bound to infer that Sargon served in a cult, and not as a servant of the living king. The sources enable us to fill up the entire break between the end of Obverse IV. and Reverse I., thus permitting an almost exact reconstruction of the size of the tablet, a fact which has been of greatest value in the discussion of the Nabonidus dates. With the Reverse of the new tablet we now learn that Rimush was the son of

Sargon, and succeeded his father to the throne. Sargon is credited with the long reign of 55 years. Rimush reigned 15 years. The tablet then gives as the third king, Maništesu, and then [. . . *Ri-mu-uš*, which Legrain restores, 'son of Rimush.' This restoration is confirmed by a new join to the Legrain tablet. Now there is a long inscription of a king of Agade, in which he endowed the temple of the sun-god at Sippar,¹ and in which he is described as the son of Sargon. This inscription, however, is almost certainly to be assigned to Manishtusu, for it records the conquest of Anshan and Shirišum in terms identical with an inscription of Manishtusu at Nippur.² I suggest that the scribe of the cruciform monument meant grandson of Sargon when he described Manishtusu as 'son' of Sargon. In the same way Narām-Sin, who was really the great-grandson of Sargon, became in tradition the son of Sargon. According to Legrain's new join, which he has been good enough to send me (April 6), Manishtusu reigned 7 years, and his son Narām-Sin 56 years. Legrain's new join seems to omit Imi, and spells the name of Igigi as I-ki-[ki] (?). The Scheil tablet assigns 197 years to the empire of Agade, which was succeeded by the short fourth kingdom of Erech, five kings and 26 years in all. These belong, in the break at the top of Legrain's tablet Reverse II., where the text continues with the kingdom of Agade. From this text and the inscriptions the names of ten of the twenty-one kings of the Gutium period can be restored. The period of 125 years ended with *Tirikān*, and was followed by the fifth kingdom of Erech, whose founder was Utuḫegal. This kingdom is now the only unknown factor in our knowledge of the dynastic lists before Ur-Engur, whose date is fairly certain (2474). Since the four kings of Ur are to be placed at the end of the break on Legrain Reverse III. and the top of Reverse IV. there is space for about three names here. I assign 50 years to the last kingdom of Erech and the period between the dynasty of Gutium and Ur-Engur.

It will be seen that the chronology before 2474 is now placed on a foundation approaching certainty. The degree of uncertainty is not great, although the date of departure (2474) for the reconstruction is still disputed, some wishing to reduce the figure

¹ See King, *The Cruciform Monument of Manishtusu, *Revue d'Assyriologie*.

² Poebel, *P.B.S.* iv. 205.

by more than a century. Accepting 2474 as the date of the founding of the last empire of Ur, I have reconstructed the outline of ancient history in the table appended to this paper. Operating with most conservative figures, we are bound to begin authentic history in Mesopotamia as early as 5000 B.C., when the Semite was already in the land. The period of earlier Sumerian migration and occupation is left to conjecture.

Kish (first kingdom), semi-mythical, about 21 kings.
 Erech (first kingdom), semi-mythical, about 11 kings.
 Ur (first kingdom), 4316-4145 (171).
 Awan, 4145-4045 (100)? Dynastic tablet, 356!
 Ur (second kingdom), 4045-3937 (108).

Kish (second kingdom, 6 kings), 3937-3745 (192!). (Dynastic tablet, 3792 years for this kingdom).
 Hamazi, 3745-3738 (7).
 Kish (third kingdom), 3738-3588 (150). *Mesilim*, etc.
 Erech (second kingdom), 3588-3358 (130).
 Adab, 3358-3268 (90).
 Ma-er, 3268-3188 (80).
 Akšak, 3188-3089 (99). *Ur-Ninā*.
 Kish (fourth kingdom), 3089-2897 (192). *Entemena*, etc.
 Erech (third kingdom), 2897-2872 (25).
 Agade, 2872-2675 (197).
 Erech (fourth kingdom), 2675-2649 (26).
 Gutium, 2649-2524 (125).
 Erech (fifth kingdom), 2524-2474 (50).
 Ur (third kingdom), 2474-2357 (117).
 Isin, 2357-2132 (225).
 First Babylonian Dynasty, 2225-1926 (299).

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Heart Satisfied.

'One . . . whose heart the Lord opened.'—Ac 16¹⁴.

ONE can never look into the eyes of a little Indian girl and not feel that there is a wonderful something behind them. It is a hungry look—a look that says, 'I want love, and I want to know.'

A missionary in India tells of a little village girl who came to her after an open-air meeting and said that she was a Christian. She was taken to live at the mission station and there she was given the name of Star. She and the lady missionary became great friends. Love came as a charm to Star. It opened her eyes so that she could see God; it opened her lips too, and she could not keep from telling her friend all that was in her heart.

Almost a year after the open-air meeting at which Star confessed herself a Christian, they were together at a camp-meeting in a tent. The air was stifling, and when it was over they wandered out together to get cooled. Hand in hand they walked about over the great sandy plain on which their tents were pitched. The wonder of the night with all its solemn grandeur broke in upon the mind of the Indian girl like the sense of a great Presence. When at last they lay down on the

sand and had been quite silent for some time Star spoke.

'Amma,' she said softly, 'this reminds me of the night I first spoke with God.' It was with the little Indian girl as with Abraham when God spoke to him as a man speaketh to his friend.

Then Star went on to tell how when she used to look at her hands and feet she kept asking herself, 'Who made me? Was it Siva the great God of India?' She asked her father too; he did not seem to know, and tried to put her off. At last she decided on a plan by which she was sure she could find out. She had a very trying temper, and was so overbearing that other children could not be induced to play with her. To go round all the gods she knew, and find out which of them could change her disposition would, she felt sure, lead her in time to the god who had made her.

So she prayed to Siva. 'O heavenly Siva, hear me! Change my disposition that other children may love me and wish to play with me.' No change came. And in despair she went away into the jungle and laid her head on the ground and cried for help to come. And still she wondered who made her. 'Who am I?' 'Why was I made?' she asked every one who would listen, and her people began to think her strange. She was a sensitive child and made up her mind she would never ask questions again, but she thought all the more.

The answer came in an unlooked-for, yet old-fashioned way. It makes one think of how the *boldness* of Peter and John made the learned members of the Sanhedrin take knowledge of them 'that they had been with Jesus.'

Star had gone for water to a well on the outskirts of the town. Near the well she noticed a crowd. She forgot about her work and went to look and listen. 'There were three white people,' she told the missionary afterwards, 'and a talking noise, and a singing noise, and a box which made a noise.' It was of course just an open-air meeting, and the singing was being helped by some half-dozen Indian converts.

She moved away, but a madman came and tried to disturb the meeting. 'See the white man beat the madman,' shouted the crowd—and she went back to listen. But the white man simply put his arm on the madman's shoulder, and drew him gently out of the crowd while an Indian brother continued speaking. Again she turned to go. And then a sentence reached her ears. 'There is a living God. There is a living God: He turned me, a lion, into a lamb.'

Here was the true answer to her questions. She did not want sleep that night. She wanted to lie awake and talk to the living God. Next morning a feeling of new happiness came to her. She danced as she walked. She found her way to the Christian camp, and sat on the floor of the tent with the other children, and learned a chorus which was easily understood and which she never forgot. 'My heart was like a little room,' she said to the missionary. 'It could not hold much then. Only I understood you said that the true God heard us when we prayed, and very dearly loved us all.'

Enough for her, she had seen a man who had been changed through being in the company of Jesus Christ. And that little Indian girl became a great helper to the missionary in her work. She used to go round and visit the women with her. Sometimes she even spoke to them. Let me repeat to you one of her little sermons.

'Sister, we have come to bring good news to you. There is a living God who loves you. He has always loved you. He sent us here to tell you so. Take it! His love is all for you. Oh, sister, this news was beautiful to me, and the joy of joys.'

Our Home.

'The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider.'—Is 1st.

Isaiah just meant that some people have less sense than dumb beasts. A cow knows exactly where its byre is, and a donkey will find the stable his master has provided for him, but there are men and women so stupid that they never think of coming home to God.

There are many stories of how a dog may find its way home from some far-off place to which it has been sent. Pussy does the same; wherever she is, the old home calls her.

The other day I read a delightful tale about a little mouse. If it is not quite true in every little detail, the spirit of it is the same as that which unites human children with the humbler children of nature. Let me tell you my story. A farm wagon was lumbering along a road in America. Three boys and their dog were romping about in the body of the wagon. There were sacks and barrels on the floor of it, and what with the dog barking and jumping about, and a good-natured farm-hand as driver, they were having great fun. 'Here's a mouse!' called one of the boys as he lifted a sack. 'Turn him out and let Cæsar have him,' cried another. The boy could easily have reached into the barrel himself, but he thought it would be better fun to let the dog have a hunt. He tipped the keg over, and the mouse tumbled to the floor. Cæsar leaped for it, but the mouse instantly slipped beneath another barrel. A boy lifted the barrel and the mouse darted into a crack in the floor of the wagon and so fell to the ground.

The boys and their dog leaped from the wagon in chase, but the mouse dodged them, ran beneath a fallen tree, and just as the dog was within reach scrambled into an old hollow stump where two little field-mice lived. The dog whined, and one boy stood debating with himself what to do, but the others called him to come on. So he whistled to the dog and ran after the wagon, leaving the mouse in safety.

The boys all decided that the little beast had got away 'fair,' and one prophesied that he would be back at the farm to eat his thanksgiving dinner. 'It's only about a mile,' he said; 'trust him to find his way.'

Inside the tree-stump were two little beating hearts. The entrance of the frightened little

blue-grey mouse, the shouting of the boys and the whining of the dog made the field-mice fear that their shelter was to be torn away and themselves caught and killed; but in less than a minute our mouse was quite calm as if he were accustomed to such narrow escapes.

The field-mice were puzzled with their visitor, but they treated him in a friendly way, and invited him to share their store of nuts and corn. Of course a mouse from a farmhouse knew how to chisel the soft heart out of the grains of corn; he had often done that, and he had now and then eaten nuts which the boys had brought home, but he could not eat the bits of bark and the grass which the field-mice seemed to like.

After a little while he wearied. He missed many things that were at the farm, even the big, grey cat. He remembered how he used to tease her; and it was great fun to creep to the mouth of a hole and pretend to be going out, and make her wait and wait and sometimes jump and miss.

This was really a very dull place to live in, he decided. He made up his mind that he would go back to the farmhouse that very night as soon as it was dark; and he set out then. Crossing a mill-stream on the top of a sluice, he kept close by a paling, running sometimes on the bars, and hiding at the foot of a post when anything frightened him. Farther along, an owl made a swoop at him and missed. Then he found a burrow running deep into the ground and took a rest in the mouth of it. 'A good thing he did, for he saw a ferret on the prowl. That drove him headlong into the burrow and down to the very bottom of it. The ferret started to dig him out, but found that the burrow was deeper than he thought and at last went away. The mouse did not come out at all that night, and all next day he lay in the burrow with nothing to eat. At night he began his journeyings again, hunted at every step by some enemy.

It was many a day before a thin, hungry, tired, frightened mouse crept in at a cellar window and made his way to a nest behind the cellar stairs of the farmhouse. What tales he had to tell to the brothers and sisters and aunts and cousins who crowded round him to hear. They had all thought the cat had got him that day when he climbed into the keg among the sacks and was carried away in the farm wagon.

So you see that the call of home has a universal way of making even dumb creatures home-sick.

Boys and girls, you have come from God. In this world one meets with many kind people; you make friends that are very dear to you, but at times you hear another voice that keeps calling to you. Without warning, that voice comes again and again; it speaks of God being your home. There was a great poet who expressed what many people feel, although they cannot get words to express their feelings. His name was Wordsworth. In his most beautiful poem he gives a key to unlock the real meaning of the Prophet's words. We come from God who is our home, and we forget it—

Not in entire forgetfulness,
And not in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God who is our home:

When God calls to you to come to Him, it does not mean that you leave this world. You can be at home with Him at your work or at play. He wishes your youth to be happy; but never let it be such that at night you would be ashamed to say, 'Father, I come home to you.'

The Christian Year.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Waiting Earth.

'Waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God.'—Ro 8¹⁹.

Paul has been regarded as a pessimist, and if optimism means the belief that this world as it stands is the best of all possible worlds, then it is difficult to clear him of the charge. He found the world deeply marked with failure and imperfection; but he never dreamed that it need remain so, or that it could ultimately remain so. The whole universe, he says, is groaning and travailing in pain. It is full of suffering and it is a slave to decay—'subject to vanity.' That word, echoing the haunting refrain of Ecclesiastes, the classic of pessimism, accurately calls up those suggestions of tiresome futility which the world of nature with its ceaseless round of change and decay brought to the mind of Paul as of many other observers, especially in the East. Man, too, is part of nature, and shares its heritage of pain and thwarted en-

deavour. 'They were born; they were wretched; they died.' So in an Eastern tale the Wise Man sums up the course of human history. So far the outlook of Paul agrees with the Oriental pessimism.

But for him that is not the whole story. Beside the groaning and travailing there is in the world an 'eager expectation.' The whole universe, with head outstretched and intense gaze, is waiting for something very glorious which shall finally deliver it from slavery to futility and give a meaning to all its pangs. It is a sorry world, but an expectant world, subject to vanity, but saved in hope; travailing now, but destined to glory. It is a world, above all, with a real history; and that is what Oriental pessimism never allows. But the conception of a universe in which there is real movement and real development is very congenial to the modern mind. Indeed, we feel ourselves here very much at one with Paul in his view of the world. We, like him, dare not deny the miserable facts of pain and failure, in nature and in man as part of nature; but we would fain believe that the change and flux have a tendency, and that tendency an upward one. That the upward tendency is automatic and inevitable we are perhaps less sure than our fathers. Perhaps we feel, like Paul, that the universe—or at least this earth—is waiting for something. And perhaps, too, Paul was right in thinking that the key to its destiny was in the hand of man.

For us, even more definitely than for him, man is part of nature. In man the energy of the material world, the instinct of animal life, rises—precariously and incompletely, but really—into the sphere of consciousness and of will. In him the apparently blind impulse towards greater perfection working, as we believe, in the universe, attains a measure of freedom and self-direction. In him also instinct, become rational, can turn back upon the material world out of which he has partly emerged and actually control its changes, aid its advance, intercept its decay. Directly upon his body, indirectly upon other parts of the physical universe, the thought of man, and the action which is the outcome of his thought, works beneficently or destructively according to his choice. For the most part his action upon the world seems blundering and of doubtful value. The immense control of matter that man has gained—our so-called 'progress'—is of very uncertain benefit to the universe conceived as a system aiming at perfec-

tion in every part after its kind. But if man himself could be different; if his own life were altered by the attainment of right relations with God and with his fellow-man, his rôle in the world in which he lives might be a more beneficent one than we can well imagine. The artist uses the material world as means to the expression of that love of beauty which is one aspect of the love of God, and thereby transfigures the material—delivers it, as Paul might say, from the bondage of decay into the liberty of glory. If we could all become artists over the whole of life, using our whole environment to express the highest spiritual relations within our reach, is it not possible that the influence of humanity upon the world might change its whole aspect? Paul at least thought that in some way the universe was waiting for man to attain right relations in the spiritual sphere—'waiting for the revealing of the sons of God.'

A recent poem addresses 'Everyman' in language which beautifully suggests a thought akin to Paul's:¹

All things search until they find
God through the gateway of thy mind.

Highest star and humblest clod
Turn home through thee to God.

When thou rejoicest in the rose
Blissful from earth to heaven she goes;

Upon thy bosom summer seas
Escape from their captivities;

Within thy sleep the sightless eyes
Of night revisage Paradise;

In thy soft awe yon mountain high
To his creator draweth nigh;

This lonely tarn, reflecting thee,
Returneth to eternity;

And thus in thee the circuit vast
Is rounded and complete at last,

And at last, through thee revealed
To God, what time and space concealed.²

¹ Quoted from the poem 'To Everyman,' by Edith Anne Stewart, published in the *Nation*, November 1918.

² C. R. Dodd, *The Meaning of Paul for To-Day*.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Commercial Life.

'The love of money is a root of all kinds of evil.'—
1 Ti 6¹⁰ (R.V.).

We are told to love each other, to desire each the other's good as though it were his own, to let sympathy, magnanimity, generosity, control our thought and conduct. Then we go out into the scramble of our commercial life. Just how can the ideal of service be naturalized in so alien a land as this industrial system of competing individuals, corporations, economic groups, and greedy nations, all struggling for profit? Let it be frankly said that the problem is fundamentally social; that no man alone can satisfactorily solve it in his own life until society as a whole makes economic relationships more decent than they are. In the meantime, however, some obvious duties are enjoined upon the individual by Christian principles.

1. For one thing, let a man take both his investments and his personal work away from any business that in its main intention is not useful to the community! That business and service ever should conflict is the more pathetic, because the basic idea of all good business is to serve the people. A fair bargain is far better than charity, for charity involves one man in want served by a superior, while a fair bargain involves two men on an equality, the exchange of whose goods is a mutual benefit. So Ruskin, summing up the functions of the five great intellectual professions which have existed in every civilized country, says: 'The Soldier's profession is to defend it; the Pastor's to teach it; the Physician's to keep it in health; the Lawyer's to enforce justice in it; the Merchant's to provide for it.' Service is the primary intention of commerce. And the tragedy of our economic conflict lies here: the very purpose of business is perverted when service which should be first is put last, or is lost sight of altogether. In war we have seen how indispensable to the common weal are farm and shop and factory, railroad and steamship line; in war we appealed for industrial help not alone to avarice but to loyalty, not alone to greed but to patriotism. Has that appeal no standing ground in time of peace? What traitors are in the army, what hypocrites are in the ministry, what shysters are in the law, what quacks are in medicine—per-

versions and caricatures of their profession's main intention—so are men in business who have lost sight of their function as loyal servants of the common weal in providing for the needs of men. The first duty of a Christian, therefore, is to desert, with his money and his labour, any parasitic, useless business, any traffic that seeks something for nothing, or that makes profit from demoralizing men. A Christian must at least be conscious that he is in a business upon whose presence in some form the happy maintenance of human society depends.

2. Again, a Christian must never in any business be a consenting party to the sacrifice of manhood and womanhood for profit. When Ruskin had exalted the five professions, with the merchant as the climax of them all, he turned to define their obligation to society: 'The duty of all these men is, on due occasion, to die for it. "On due occasion" namely: the Soldier, rather than leave his post in battle; the Physician, rather than leave his post in plague; the Pastor, rather than teach falsehood; the Lawyer, rather than countenance injustice; the Merchant — what is *his* "due occasion" of death? It is the main question for the Merchant.' That question is not difficult for a Christian to answer. The merchant should die rather than willingly make profit that involves the degradation of manhood and womanhood.

Lord Shaftesbury, the great Christian philanthropist, and his allies worked fourteen years to secure a Ten-hour Bill in England. How widely was he helped by Christian business men, who knew as well as he did that in Lancashire alone, for example, 35,000 children, from five to thirteen years of age, were working fourteen and fifteen hours a day in the factories to pile up profits for them? Let Lord Shaftesbury's diary answer: 'Prepared as I am, I am oftentimes distressed and puzzled by the strange contrasts I find; support from infidels and non-professors; opposition or coldness from religionists or declaimers.' 'I find that evangelical religionists are not those on whom I can rely. The factory, and every question for what is called "humanity," receive as much support from the men of the world as from church men, who say they will have nothing to do with it.' 'Last night pushed the Bill through the committee; a feeble and discreditable opposition! "Sinners" were with me; "saints" were against me—strange contradiction in human nature.' 'The clergy here

(Manchester) as usual are cowed by capital and power. I find none who cry aloud and spare not; but so it is everywhere.' Such records are the disgrace of the Church. No money can be so spent in charity as to atone for such a satanic spirit in its making. A disciple of Jesus must be free from such willing consent to take profit out of human degradation. This does not mean that he must throw away securities in every business whose policies he disapproves; it does mean that, however his private fortune may be affected, he must by every means in his power fight those policies and that he must always be on the side of any movement which promises more decent living to men and women. To put profits before personality is the swiftest and completest way of denying everything that Jesus ever said. Let a man be a pagan and say so, if he so chooses; but let him not call himself a follower of Jesus, while he forgets the spirit of Jesus: 'It were well for him if a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were thrown into the sea, rather than that he should cause one of these little ones to stumble.'¹

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Sovereignty of Love.

'Leave there thy gift before the altar.'—Mt 5²⁴.

The greatest of the appeals of Jesus was for love, love of the Father and of man, the Father's child; the love of the mind as well as the heart, of all the soul, and all the strength. That, said Jesus, is Religion; that is what it means; nothing less. On these two commands hang all the law and all the prophets: whatever has been enacted in Mosaism, or announced by the Seers of God, will be found there; and by obedience to these commands man and men find all-blessedness here and hereafter.

They are commands: but can love be commanded? Is it not spontaneous; does it not rise into being like water from a full fountain? Can we control it? Do we not 'fall' in love, and rest when we reach the object loved, just as a stone set free falls to the earth? But the law repeated by Jesus meets us with an imperative 'Thou shalt'; it is not we *may*, but we *must*; and therefore we may conclude that though it looks impossible, it is not. And experience, as set forth in history as well as in many a novel, assures us it is done.

¹ H. E. Fosdick, *The Meaning of Service*.

Men and women do control their emotions, love where they do not like because they feel they ought; mothers and fathers for prodigal children, brothers towards unworthy brothers and sisters, and in thousands of other cases.

Aristotle said, 'You cannot love God, for He is unknowable'; but Jesus, the authority in the religious sphere, has revealed God, made Him knowable, accessible and companionable; and given us the express image of His mysterious and unfathomable personality in Himself, so that we may welcome the great commandments, first in the light of the revelation Jesus has given us in Himself of what the keeping of them means, and secondly, with the assurance that the righteous Father who gives us this law will not only incline our hearts to keep it, but sustain us with His strength and inspire us by His Spirit, so that we may do it with glad and thankful devotion.

1. The burden of the teaching of Jesus was the duty of love; and in His Sermon on the Mount He sets it forth in its wide range and most exacting demands as the sure way to brotherhood. He utters His message with authority, and sets out the verdicts of His contemporaries against His own, as one who claims the higher right to speak; and all through the one governing principle is love. Anger is a violation of brotherhood, and therefore it must go. Social purity is an obligation of brotherhood, and it must be secured in the innermost of the heart. Retaliation is alien to fraternity, and can have no place within its boundaries. In the ideal brotherhood it is not enough to abstain from murder, you must also banish hate; it can have no place in the plan of Christ, for hatred is the root and cause of murder. In like manner not only is anger under the ban of Jesus, but the contempt of man for man, despal of a brother, must be quenched or displaced by love. 'Love your enemies,' is our Master's law, for the reign of God is not completely established till all men love one another with pure hearts fervently. Worship itself will be an offence to God and not an acceptable sacrifice from the heart that fails to seek reconciliation with a brother who is hurt or thinks that he is; 'leave there thy gift before the altar,—do not lift it; but leave it, and go and be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.' The practice of brotherhood is a paramount obligation.

2. Now the charm of that strange and high

teaching is that it was illustrated and enforced in the wonderfully loving life of our Master. He taught no principle He did not work, and gave no counsel He did not Himself follow. His love was as universal as it was strong, as impartial as it was pure, and as original as it was magnetic. He loved good people, Lazarus, and Mary and Martha, as well as his mother and brothers and sisters; but He said expressly that it was His mission to seek out and save the lost, and that therefore He did not call the righteous to see Him and talk with Him, but the sinners; and we know they heard Him gladly and were in the habit of crowding round Him that they might listen to His speech.

Mr. Claude Montefiore, a most able and candid Jewish writer, says: 'I should be far from attempting to deny that one of the original elements in the Gospel is that the summons was not to wait till they met you in the sheltered and orderly path, but to go forth and seek out and redeem the sinner and the fallen, the passion to heal and bring back to God the wretched and the outcast,—all this I do not find in Rabbinism—that form of love seems lacking.' But it was the chief form in Jesus. Everybody saw that, however they interpreted it. To some it was an offence; He made too much of bad men. He behaved as if He did not know that they were sinners; but to others it was glad tidings of great joy. They were saying, 'Nobody cares for us; nobody wants us unless they can make something out of us.' Nobody saw them. They did not count. They were not even ciphers; but Jesus, in whose bosom pity reigned, went from His own circle into theirs; left His mother and His home, that He might enter their homes; loved them; loved them even unto death, actually died for them the death of the Cross. 'Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends'; but 'God commendeth his love toward us, in that, whilst we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' He did not wait for our love, but poured out His own for our redemption.

3. That is our Master's teaching, and that is His example. In Him and in His counsels the ideal brotherly life is realized. Now Jesus built His Church to carry on the same task; to continue the same counsels, and to repeat His example. That is certain, and the aim therefore of His disciples must be to form a society in which the lost shall be sought out and saved; the called

and chosen shall be gathered, instructed, and equipped for service; the repentant shall know their pardon and shall rejoice in their reconciliation to God; the distressed and afflicted shall be comforted, and all the members shall love God supremely, be humble and sincere in spirit, meek and lowly in heart; eager for righteousness, patient under persecution, and filled with all the fulness of God. In a surprising measure that ideal was realized in the Churches of the first years of the Christian Gospel. The Christians really did love one another. Their passion for saving others was at a white heat. They went everywhere preaching the word, and were ready to suffer all things for the sake of Christ and men. In nothing were they terrified by their enemies. Some of them went far in repeating the sufferings of Christ for His body's sake, which is the Church. They despaired of no one. Like Angelo they saw the angel in the stone, and worked on till they brought it out. Paul catalogues their result in a memorable picture from the slums of Corinth, of thieves and drunkards, idolaters and profiteers, all washed, sanctified and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God. They attained to a degree of sainthood that compelled the admiration of the Romans. 'What women these Christians are!' said one; 'How these Christians love one another!' said another; and it can be claimed without question that the moral and spiritual achievements of the Christian Churches of the first century created a new epoch in the life of mankind.

4. It is our joy to be in that Brotherhood succession. On us is cast the responsibility of practising the teaching and following the example of our Master. In that way and along His lines we must love God and our neighbours. Nothing less will meet His claims; nothing less will heal our diseased world, remove its woes, lead it in right paths, get rid of drunkenness and the money lust, and make wars to cease to the ends of the earth. It is love that saves—love in God and in men. All our relations rest upon and are governed by love, in the family, in the church, in industry, and in society. We owe it to one another everywhere; but first of all in the societies in which Jesus, the great lover of mankind, dwells.

(1) Purity is an individual obligation essential to the virility of the man; but it is also an obligation of brotherhood for society and urgently necessary for its strength and efficiency.

(2) We owe absolute veracity to one another: 'Lie not one to another,' says Paul; for the man who fails in truthfulness not only injures himself, but he also inflicts a wrong on the society to which he belongs.

(3) The censorious must have no place amongst us; and if a man be overtaken in a fault, 'ye who are spiritual,' Paul tells us, must restore such a one in the spirit of meekness, considering your own weakness and insecurity.

(4) Retaliation is entirely forbidden. Vengeance is not for us. It is utterly alien to the temper of our Master. We must be more willing to suffer wrong than to inflict it. Better sacrifice our own feelings than hurt the feelings of others.

(5) Above all cherish the spirit of forgiveness. There is no moral quality on which the Master laid more emphasis than on that. Our prayer for personal forgiveness is tied up with our obligation to forgive others. That is the only petition in the Lord's Prayer that receives any reinforcement. Forgiveness is of the very essence of the brotherly life. Jesus gave a parable of striking suggestiveness to strengthen His appeal, He described it as a distinguishing mark of the Church He builds, and He gives special directions for overcoming an obstinate difficulty occurring in the way of its exercise.¹

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Human Needs.

'But my God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus.'—Ph 4¹⁹.

1. The needs of human nature may be studied either in the average man, who is the easier object-lesson for us, or in the best man, who feels them more acutely, and may be supposed to know more of their meaning. But either way will bring us to nearly the same result; for even genius, in religion as elsewhere, cannot do more than see clearly what common men see more or less obscurely. Taking then the average man as our most convenient guide—for popular religion has always been much of a muchness in all countries—the first thing we notice is his want of practical self-confidence. He is not generally wanting in some sort of religious feeling good or bad, for comparatively few succeed in getting entirely rid of it; but he shrinks from

a direct approach to the divine, and tries to shelter himself behind somebody he supposes to be on better terms with heaven than he is himself. His cry is always, Speak thou with us, and we will hear: but let not God speak with us, lest we die. What he wants is a prophet, to speak for God to him—not necessarily or even chiefly to foretell the future, though he is glad of this too—but to tell him with authority the meaning of the present in its relation to unseen powers, or in the higher religions, in its relation to a living God. Such authority he may suppose given by outside credentials; but he is not unlikely to see more and more clearly that the moral or intrinsic authority of a holy life is more fundamental and less easily discredited by scandals and intellectual doubts. In short, he needs a man who can light up the obscure leadings of his conscience by telling him more exactly what he ought to do, or rather what he ought to be; for if the lower religions largely deal in works of law, the higher point with increasing urgency to character as the only thing in man which can have any moral value.

2. Again, the average man is never quite at ease with himself. He may obscure his conscience by excess; or harden himself against it, or deaden it by simple neglect; or he may try to reason himself out of it, and even boast that he does not know what it means; but neither the practical nor the intellectual method of getting rid of it is quite successful. However he may banish the dread spectre of remorse from common life, he never knows when or with what awful power it may return. So he usually keeps on terms with religion; and even where men do not, the women do. Yet here again he shrinks from direct relations with the divine, and seeks the mediation of those who seem more worthy than himself to speak with heaven. Strange and varied rites of sacrifice bear witness in all ages to the terrible power over him of this consciousness of sin, and to his inability to overcome it for himself. We scarcely hear of 'the efficacy of repentance,' except from the Deists; and modern science has thrown a lurid light on the indelible consequences of our evil doings. Sacrificing priests are found in most religions, and have crept into some which, like Christianity, originally had none. Yet the priests are only men a little better or may be a little worse than the worshippers, and their ceremonies are sometimes immoral, often irrational, always arbitrary in having

¹ J. Clifford, *The Gospel of World Brotherhood according to Jesus*, p. 141 ff.

no true relation to sin. Even if the sacrifices be supposed to remove the guilt of particular sins, the need of repeating them is proof enough that they cannot touch the roots of sin. The man he needs to speak for him to God is, if it be possible, a priest of a better sort, not constituted by custom or by positive law, but by personal character, for no common sinner can be supposed to do effectually what these conventional sacrifices only do in a limited and superficial way.

3. These two needs are conspicuous in history, and most religions have aimed at the ideals corresponding to them. A third, which is no less real, though less prominent in past ages, seems likely to be more and more distinctly recognized in the future. The average man is not quite unconscious of his deep estrangement from his fellow-men. He may get on with his neighbours, and even with his kinsmen at the ends of the earth; though we hear of class divisions and family quarrels, and have ample experience that the closest of all ties has no charm that cannot be broken by bitter hatred. Still less are nations united. The very links of commerce, religion, and general intercourse that bring them together are turned into occasions for quarrels. The civilized world has not quite outgrown the old heathen feeling that the stranger is an enemy, and that coloured people at any rate are made to be plundered by their betters.

But this is not the power of the future. Though the nations hate each other more actively than they did half a century ago, there is more unity among them, and more consciousness of unity. Commerce is international, so is thought, and so is civilization generally; so that civilized people all over the world are growing more like each other in manners, in administration, and in ways of thinking. The forces of the future make for unity, and are seen to make for unity. The value of the individual, which is our great inheritance from the nineteenth century, gave new value to the nations in which he is grouped.

We are all agreed, except the pessimists, that some uplifting force is working in the world. Whether we call it divine or not, no others will dispute the action of such a force in geological and in historic times; and no Theist will feel it safe to place limits on the possibilities of its future working. Nor will any ideal fairly indicated by the deepest needs of human nature seem impossible to those who measure the ages of the future by the ages of the past; and even less will those dismiss it as a dream who believe in the life after death which is postulated by every human thought and every human feeling which is not entirely bestial.¹

¹ H. M. Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God*.

The Hebrew Prophet and the Christian Preacher.

BY THE REVEREND ALFRED E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

THERE are Christian preachers who know so well the Bible and the soul of man that they are never at a loss for a subject or a text on which to preach. In their study and meditation the Bible and the soul of man so respond to one another, deep answering unto deep, that they can always find a message from the one for the other. But this is not the happy lot of all preachers, and there are some who are glad of suggestion and direction in regard to the best method of carrying on their work with profit to their hearers and without strain to themselves. As a result of my own personal experience in recent years, I should like to call the attention of such of my brethren as

may feel this need to what seems to me an inexhaustible source of material for the pulpit. Doubtless this has often been done before, but a fresh treatment of an old subject may sometimes serve to revive a lacking interest.

1. I have been led during the war, and even since the peace, to turn more to the Hebrew prophets than I ever did during my previous ministry. While trying to keep myself, as far as I could, abreast of what modern scholarship had to tell about the Old Testament, I must confess that my dominant, and sometimes almost exclusive, interest was in the New, especially the Gospels, the Person and Work of Jesus Christ our Lord.

That interest has not in any way declined, but the interest in the Old Testament has increased for three reasons. (i.) During the war and even since the peace the duty of the Christian Church towards the nation has gained a fresh emphasis. I have always been interested in, and an advocate of, social reform; and my preaching has, I fear, been sometimes a scandal to the hearers, who want 'no politics in the pulpit.' But the position of the nation and of other nations during the war was so tragic and perilous, and still is so ominous, that even in the interests of the Kingdom of God itself apart from the motives of patriotism, which a Christian minister should feel no less than any other citizen, it seemed a duty to deal with national affairs from the standpoint of religion and morals. Now the Hebrew prophets addressed themselves to the nation, the judgment they threatened or the mercy they promised was for the nation. Individualism and universalism do emerge in Jeremiah and Ezekiel; but the note that is usually struck is a nationalism, which is both moral and religious, and not less real or intense because thus restrained. Their utterances have thus a special fitness for the times in which we live. (ii.) Not only do times of security, prosperity, and progress in a nation lay less constraint on the preacher to deal with national affairs, but such conditions offer less likeness to the circumstances amid which the Hebrew prophets delivered their message. It was in periods of danger, disturbance, distress, and even despair, that the prophets stepped forth to interpret the course of human events as the purpose of divine providence in judgment or mercy. While the resemblance of conditions during the war might be closer than since the peace, yet even at home and still more abroad the position remains very unstable and even precarious; and thus a striking correspondence between the circumstances of the Hebrew prophet and the Christian preacher to-day still remains. (iii.) While the prophets addressed themselves to their own people and age, and should probably have been surprised to learn how permanent and universal their influence was to become, yet as they spoke in time and place for the eternal and infinite God, their warnings or their encouragements express moral and religious principles which are valid for all peoples and all ages. Because they spoke to a nation in circumstances similar to our own, the principles

they enunciated have meaning and worth for us.

2. An objection may readily be made which needs to be answered at once. It may be said: Why go to the Old Testament at all? Is not the Christian ideal presented in the New Testament, and for that and that alone the Christian Church should witness? This objection may be met by several considerations. (i.) The Christian ideal should not be isolated from its historical background in the Old Testament. In nature and history alike no stage of an evolution should be cut off from the previous stages, as by knowing them we can best understand it. Jesus did not so separate Himself; He came not to destroy the law and the prophets but to fulfil, and that means not merely to supersede, or to correct imperfection, but to continue in the new all that in the old is consistent with it, and even complementary to it. It was the mistake of the pacifists, it seems to me, that they so isolated Jesus and His teaching. There was a revelation of God to the Hebrew nation which in morals and religion alike was the preparation, and the necessary preparation, for Him. We do not apprehend the Christian ideal fully unless we take account of its antecedents in law and prophecy. (ii.) Paul in his vigorous polemic opposed Law and Gospel; we must not so oppose the Old and the New Testament; there are resemblances as well as differences, there is continuity as well as change. Christian religion and morals have certainly suffered in the past from an indiscriminate use of the Old Testament. During the war even the Old Testament was used to justify a temper which was not at all Christian. The practices recorded in the Book of Judges are not precedents for the Christian Church; no circumstances could give the Imprecatory Psalms a legitimate place in Christian worship. But the prophets do not represent the lower popular religion and morals. They are the agents of the progressive revelation which ends in Christ. They have their imperfections and limitations from the Christian standpoint; and nevertheless their affinities with the Christian ideal are often very striking. If we know how to trace the line of advance in the teaching of the Old Testament, we shall be able to distinguish the utterances that belong to the temporary and local conditions from those which anticipate the voice of the Son speaking in the name of the Father. It is indeed

surprising how far the prophets are in advance of their contemporaries, and how far they reach forward to clasp hands with Jesus and His disciples. They utter truths about God and goodness that can never be superseded, but will ever come as an authentic revelation from God to men. (iii.) For the reasons given in the preceding section, the utterances of the prophets have a special interest and authority for us to-day. They do interpret the course of human history as the purpose of the divine providence, but they do not, as some preachers seemed to assume, represent that purpose as exclusively, or even dominantly, judgment, for they speak by preference of mercy. They are messengers of life as well as heralds of doom. In this respect they can serve to correct a prevailing tendency. If there was some excuse for preachers during the war declaring with vehemence that God doeth terrible things in His righteousness, there is no justification for their now forgetting that judgment is His strange work, but in mercy is His delight. There was not a little Pharisaism in the way in which Germany alone was regarded as the sinner among the nations, and the Allies as the unspotted champions of the cause of God. The policy of this nation since the armistice gives meaning for us to the warnings of the prophets against national self-righteousness; and the woeful condition of the greater part of the world bids us turn to-day to the assurances given by the prophets to a penitent and believing people of the loving-kindness and tender mercy of God.

3. Enough, it is to be hoped, has been said to prove that the Christian preacher to-day may find many a word in season in the utterances of the Hebrew prophets. Before giving some illustrations to confirm the thesis, a word or two may be said about the way in which the prophets may be used. (i.) It is necessary that in a brief introduction the historical position of the prophet should be described in so far as may be needful to make his utterance both interesting and intelligible; but care should be taken not to make the introduction so long as to distract attention from the truth which his saying expresses. So few and so brief are the opportunities of the Christian preacher to deliver to his hearers the message of faith or duty with which he is charged, that his interest as a scholar should not be allowed to misguide him into a disproportionate treatment of the circum-

stances of the prophet. Exposition of the Bible, important and valuable as that is, must be made subordinate to preaching the gospel, that is, delivering that witness about moral and spiritual reality of God and goodness, which can be the power and wisdom of God unto salvation. Not the intellectual curiosity of the preacher, but the practical necessity of his hearers should be the measure of his treatment of the history needing to be known that prophecy may be understood. (ii.) It is necessary also that the prophetic utterance be interpreted historically, that the preacher should not impose his meaning on the words, and leave his hearers under the impression that he is giving the meaning of the prophet. The short cut here is the longest way round. The preacher will find most meaning for himself and his hearers, if he will try to find out as exhaustively as he can just what the prophet meant. Preachers can get not only their texts, but even the contents of their sermons, out of the Bible. What a Hosea or a Jeremiah meant is much more valuable morally and spiritually than what men of less genius can make them mean. If preaching be, as Phillips Brooks rightly describes it, truth through personality, the prophet's personality no less than the preacher's should be so reproduced as to become the appropriate and effective medium of the truth. It seems to me that psychological insight can here add a great deal to scholarly knowledge. The experience of the prophet has to be relived if the teaching of the prophet is to be made living. Men have a keener interest in personality than in truth, the concrete reality than the abstract conception; and a doctrine will appeal to them when presented as an experience, and a duty when it is embodied in a character. The failure of a great deal of preaching is that it is thought divorced from life. (iii.) Most necessary, however, is it that the sermon shall not be only a historical or a psychological study. It is truth for to-day that the Christian preacher is concerned with. When he has laid hold of the truth in the prophet's utterance, he must apply it fully and freely to the needs of his own hearers. So long as he makes clear the distinction of the historical exposition and the practical application, he need not be over-scrupulous to confine himself rigidly within the bounds of the prophet's horizon. He need not ignore the fact that Christ has come, and has made all things new. He can look at the

prophetic principles in the light of the Christian ideal. The promise he can interpret through the fulfilment. The circumstances of his own time, and not of the prophet's, must determine in what way he shall apply the truth, although his knowledge of the latter may often help him to an understanding of the former, and *vice versa*. If he must try to relive the prophet's age, he must still more be thoroughly alive to his own age. Most of all, he must be able on the wings of the prophet's inspiration, or of the aspirations of his own soul, to soar above both the prophet's and his own age into those heavenly places where Christ sits at the right hand of God, that it may be nothing else and less than the word of the Lord which he brings to his own generation, as the prophet did to his.

4. In offering a few illustrations of how the Christian preacher may use the Hebrew prophet, I shall not attempt to fulfil either the first or the second of the three requirements just mentioned, but shall assume that all my readers are sufficiently students of the Bible to do both for themselves, and shall confine myself to a few suggestions in regard to the third requirement only. (i.) The words of Am 3², 'You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities,' teach the *penalty of privilege*. The greater the opportunity the greater the obligation and responsibility, and consequently the greater must be the judgment if the opportunity is neglected, the obligation denied, the responsibility disregarded. Great Britain holds a position among the nations to-day such as no other nation holds; many are proud, and make a boast of that position, as did Israel of the divine election. Many are the ways in which this warning can be applied to it. (ii.) The declaration of Hos 2¹⁶, 'And it shall come to pass at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me Ishi, and shalt no more call me Baali,' illustrates the fact that *religious progress depends on a new conception of God*. Until the people thought of God as his own grievous experience had taught the prophet to think, there could not be the religious revival and consequent moral reformation which was needed. We cannot supersede or transcend the conception of God as Father given by Jesus Christ as Son; but the Christian Church may need, as it often has, to rise above an imperfect apprehension of that revelation to a more

adequate. That seems to me to be a very urgent need of the present time. Among many people, and even Christian ministers, the period of the war was marked by a theological reaction. God was thought of as Judge rather than as Father, and a corresponding attitude was assumed as the duty of men. What is needed to-day is the full recovery of the Christian conception of God, anticipated as that has been by Hosea. Tenderness, gentleness, forbearance, and forgiveness are the urgent moral needs among men in a world which has not recovered, is all too slowly recovering, from the calamity through which it has passed. Such a doctrine as Hosea's, rooted in such an experience as his, is the message for the hour. We shall not recover the Christian conception of God till we return to the Christian attitude to our fellow-men. (iii.) The oft-quoted and oft-misunderstood saying of Mic 6⁸:

He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good;
And what doth the Lord require of thee,
But to do justly, and to love mercy,
And to walk humbly with thy God?

does not substitute morality for religion as seems often to be assumed, but shows rather that outward conduct depends on inward character, and inward character on personal communion with God. A man will do justly only as he loves mercy, and he will love mercy only as he walks humbly with his God. The demand to-day is for *social reconstruction*, the doing justly. Here is the summons to the Christian preacher to show that there must be *moral reformation*, the motives of all men and all classes must be changed from selfishness to unselfishness; and this change can only be brought about by *religious revival*, a return of the nation to God. (iv.) Whether the oracle in Is 19²³⁻²⁵ belongs to the prophet of Jerusalem, or must be assigned to a later age, it is assuredly a remarkable anticipation of the aspirations of the best minds of to-day for the League of Nations. Freedom of intercourse, friendly alliance, cessation of war are all represented as resting on a common faith, because of which past enmities can no longer divide. What a rebuke of failure and summons to endeavour for a divided Christendom the prophet's vision is! Does it not lay a special obligation on the Christian preacher, not only to be an enthusiastic advocate of the League of Nations, but also to urge the necessary plea that

only a Christian universalism can inspire an enduring and effective internationalism which shall make an end of war? (v.) What is most needed to-day in religion, morals, and all other higher interests of mankind is a courageous progress. So changed is the world, that a return to the old routine is impossible. What a rebuke to a timid conservatism which clings to the past, and fears the changes the future may bring, is Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant (31³³⁻³⁴). Sacred as was the old covenant of Sinai, the prophet frankly recognizes its insufficiency for his own age, and freely anticipates another kind of covenant more suited to its needs. As Jesus confirms the prophet's anticipation, his view of the relation of God to man has permanent value; it is inward, individual, universal, and redemptive. Each of these features has significance for the conditions of our own time. (vi.) An assurance of hope and a summons to duty for the Church comes in Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones (37²⁻⁵). The mood of despondency regarding the spiritual condition of the nation and even the Church is rebuked both by the call to carry on the work of preaching, and the assurance that God has the spiritual resources for a religious revival such as is so much needed. As in the past, religious revival has followed on the proclamation freshly of a forgotten or neglected truth, the question arises, What is it that the Church must prophesy? The times at least suggest that it is the Kingdom

of God as a world-wide reconstruction of human society according to the Christian ideal of human brotherhood in Christ.

5. These are only a few of the illustrations I might draw from the much larger number of prophetic utterances which I have found helpful as preacher, and which hearers in many congregations have assured me that they have found helpful. As in Ezekiel's vision he was bidden prophesy, that is, go on with his work as preacher, in order that the dry bones might live by the breath of the Lord, so must the Church to-day not despair of preaching as a means of grace; but must seek to make its preaching prophecy, that is, inspired and inspiring utterance. I am convinced that the Church is suffering loss to-day from the literary essay, the oratorical display, the philosophical disquisition, or the poetic idyll in the pulpit. What is wanted is simple, straight, strong speech about the realities of God and man, grace and sin, duty and destiny by men who are real themselves, and so can make these realities real to their hearers. As the Spirit of God has not been withdrawn from the Church, the Christian preacher may dare to hope, and even believe, that he too can be inspired as was the Hebrew prophet, so that his preaching shall be inspiring, making the dry bones in the Church and the world live. And this inspiration may come to him as he studies honestly, that he may use courageously the utterances of the Hebrew prophets.

Contributions and Comments.

A Human Original for 'Satan.'

A COMPARISON of the incidents in Ezr 5 with the vision in Zec 3 suggests that the former may have been the historical background of, and provided the vocabulary for, the latter. They were admittedly contemporaneous. Tattenai would thus figure as the original of the character Satan, Darius as the Angel of the Lord ('a sort of Grand Vizier among the angels'), the interferences of Ezr 5^{3,6} as functions of the Adversary, and the words 'Be ye far from thence' (6⁶)—so unexpected a reproof—as the earthly counterpart to the heavenly words 'The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan.' Already it is

recognized that the plucking of the brand out of the fire refers to the release of the exiles, and that the 'filthy garments' typify the unrestored ruins: so, for instance, Dr. Sir G. A. Smith, who, however does not, so far as I know, suggest that Zechariah's thankfulness for relief from Tattenai's powerful interference may have induced the attitude of receptivity for this particular vision.

Further, these incidents, together with this prophetic narrative, occur at the very beginning of the post-exilic period. Hence all the other O.T. references to Satan (Ps 109⁸, Job 1⁶ etc., 1 Ch 21¹—contrast the pre-exilic 2 S 24¹) are subsequent to, and therefore almost certainly influenced by,

Zec 3. Moreover, there does not appear to be any Babylonian precedent for Satan as the *advocatus diaboli*, of which Zechariah might have been sub-conscious. Hence Tattenai may probably be awarded this unenviable distinction. He shares, however, with the Satan of the O.T., straightforwardness in opposition to the hero, and subservience to the Great King.

C. WESLEY HUTCHINSON.

South Shields.

'When he had tasted' (Matt. xxvii. 34).

I SUPPOSE that we may take for granted that the 'wine (R.V.) mingled with gall' of the above passage is identical with the 'wine mingled with myrrh' of Mk 15²³, and understand by it a stupefying drink given in mercy to a criminal to deaden the pain of crucifixion. We are told that a society of charitable ladies in Jerusalem provided this merciful draught. Both the evangelists who tell the incident state that Jesus declined the potion and chose to die with senses unclouded by a narcotic. But St. Matthew says that He first tasted it and then declined to drink. I have never seen any explanation of His tasting the wine. Among the commentaries accessible to me, I find no light cast upon the matter. One of them says: 'Having tasted it and ascertained its object, He would not drink.' There could be no doubt as to its object, since it was usually given on such occasions. Another says: 'He tastes and then declines, apparently because [the wine was] unpalatable.' Another says very ineptly: 'It would be very nasty to drink. He refused it.' We can quite well understand the refusal to drink for the reason already named,¹ but is it not highly probable that the tasting was a gracious acknowledgment of the kindly purpose of those who prepared and presented the draught?

JOHN WILLCOCK.

Lerwick.

A New Poet.

UNDER the title of *God's Trial*,¹ the Principal of the Moravian Theological College at Manchester has published an elegiac poem which, as is the custom of elegies, raises all the problems of

¹ *God's Trial: A Poem.* By A. H. Mumford. (London: Erskine Macdonald Ltd. N.D.)

Theodicy, and which at the height of its argument affords us, though briefly, a vision of the Christian solution. But the burden of the poem is one of grief more even than of faith—of an old, constant, unfading, unforgotten sorrow. Childhood and youth, and the beauty of this world as the mind unfolds; courtship and love and marriage, and the wonder of childbirth, and the heartbreaking loss of a little child; and then a graver bereavement still; separation, loneliness, the blackness of darkness within and without—then things are unrolled before us in a pageant of unforced heart-piercing words. The measure recalls Scott, with a difference; or the *In Memoriam* stanza, with a more marked difference; and there are remoter suggestions of the paces of Coventry Patmore's muse in his *Angel in the House*. Throughout there is wonderful freshness. Everywhere one recognizes the power that belongs to a deep personal experience of the old bitterness of the human lot—as old, the author himself reminds us, as the Book of Job or as the tale of Prometheus.

We recognize also a wonderful, perhaps a dangerous, facility. One has the impression of listening to a marvellously brilliant impromptu. No lines, or exceedingly few, seem fashioned for the rhyme's sake; but the rhyming is careless and the accentuation not infrequently is forced. Nevertheless the miraculous gift of poetry has been bestowed on Mr. Mumford. If he will devote the needful labours to polishing and perfecting his rough-hewn measures, he can assure himself a place—lower, or higher, but in any case an honourable and permanent place—in the galaxy of the English poets.

While forms and freshness are the outstanding virtues of poetry, a Christian reader is not less concerned with the substance of Mr. Mumford's message. Sorrow such as his makes every cherished belief totter, if only for a season. It overclouds or even eclipses God's sunshine. As Mr. Mumford conceives his poem, the dead arraigns God Himself, and brings Him to trial upon a charge of injustice. And the only satisfying answer is found in George Eliot's postulate: 'Humanity needs a suffering God'; to which Christian faith adds what George Eliot, alas! could not—We *have* such a God; He has verily stooped to share the burdens of struggle, temptation, and sorrow. This Christian Theodicy, repeated for us, if somewhat faintly, in Mr. Mumford's verses, rests upon the orthodox or Catholic doctrine of Christ's

person. Were Jesus Christ no more than the best of mankind, this great comfort would be lost to our suffering race. Whether we can continue to employ the traditional doctrinal expressions of Christology or must seek for others, we dare not part with our sheet anchor.

So far, then, Mr. Mumford is strikingly and positively Christian; nor would one be so hide-bound as to chide the poet for the startling utterances of his grief. And yet it seems that Christianity has additional thoughts to offer in connexion with the dark problem of sorrow. It would hardly be enough to acquit God of injustice. It is even less satisfactory if the imagined trial seems to end, one might say, in the great Accused being 'dismissed with a caution.'

Mr. Mumford compares the sorrows with the joys of life, and strikes a doubtful balance. But sorrow is not mere loss. A human friendship or affection that never passed through darkness would be poorer than one sanctified by grief. And fellowship with God in the sunshine alone—were such a thing possible—would mean less by far than the mingled lot, of sweetness and uttermost bitterness, which our God appoints for us. The 'worship of sorrow' is part of the Christian message, though assuredly not the whole. 'Blessed are they that mourn; they shall be comforted.'

Correspondingly, the keynote of a Christian life must sound out higher and louder than any strain of pathos just made bearable by faith. We glory in tribulation. The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost. God commends His love in that, when we were sinners, Christ died for us. He has indeed put a new song into our mouth; and we will praise our God as long as we have any being.

Lastly, there is a gospel in the very thought of submission to God's will. Endlessly quoted as they are, the great words of Dante can never be sufficiently laid to heart; nor are they restricted to any exceptional and imaginary destiny, but apply to all friends of God from the Son of God downwards—'In His will is our peace.' Much Christian faith suffers pain from self-inflicted wounds; and much Christian life is comparatively flaccid and ineffectual, because grief refuses to forgive God for long-past sorrows. Even Mr. Mumford's poem makes too little recognition of God's authority. We must learn still further of Him who prayed, 'O my Father, if this cup may

not pass from me, except I drink it, thy will be done.'

As it rests with Mr. Mumford to give us more perfect English poems, so also we will look to him for fuller and more helpful utterances of thankful trust in God, our Saviour. And yet we are already deep in his debt for the beautiful gift with which he has now enriched our literature, and for what the book sets before us of the glories of God in Christ.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

Manchester.

Colossians iii. 14.

CONJECTURAL Emendations in the N.T. are rightly regarded with suspicion. But when an early version, as the *Old Latin*, or, better still, a minor Greek Uncial, or a good cursive MS. gives a better sense than the usual text, the case is altered. For $\delta \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu \sigma \nu \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \circ \varsigma \tau \eta \varsigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \acute{o} \tau \eta \tau \circ \varsigma$ here, D*FG have $\delta \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu \sigma \nu \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \circ \varsigma \tau \eta \varsigma \epsilon \nu \acute{o} \tau \eta \tau \circ \varsigma$ —not (A.V., R.V.) 'which is the bond of perfectness,' but 'which is a bond of the Unity,' the oneness of the Universal Church. St. Paul is describing love. It is above all other virtues (3^{12, 13}). In 3¹⁵ he refers to our being called 'in one body.'

Then we notice that in uncial writing the change is an easy one. Omit the initial T and read N for $\Lambda \iota$ ($\Lambda \epsilon \iota$) and $\epsilon \nu \acute{o} \tau \eta \tau \circ \varsigma$ appears.

Those who pray and work and hope for re-union may value this suggestion. It has the support of the great Richard Bentley.

GEORGE FARMER.

Walmer.

The Army of Christ.

I HAVE often thought that there is a remarkable parallel, along with an equally remarkable contrast, between the commission of Christ to the Seventy¹ before sending them to the 'Lost sheep of the House of Israel' (Mt 10, Lk 10), and the directions given by the Moses of Deuteronomy (ch. 20) as to what the Jews should do in war. Probably the same idea has occurred to scores of others; but I cannot find a trace of it in the commentators accessible to me.

Let us take a few of the more striking points of similarity. First, before going to war, the Jewish

¹ I incline to think *seventy-two* is right: six for each tribe. Seventy-two is a factor of the Apocalyptic 144,000.

officers are to allow the feeble and faint-hearted, and others with a less invidious excuse, to go home. Now, it is noteworthy that in Luke, just before the discourse is given, we are told of two men who offered to go with Christ. One was obviously 'faint-hearted': our Lord tells him of the hardships of his warfare, and (though the Evangelist does not say so directly) he plainly goes back. The second has what seems to us a plausible reason for postponing his enlistment: Christ, with a certain severity, refuses his services.

Again, in Deuteronomy, when a city is about to be besieged, peace is to be offered to it: if it makes answer of peace, its inhabitants are to be subjected to the 'mas' or corvée, but are not to be otherwise ill-treated. If, on the other hand, it prefers war, then, when Yahweh has delivered it up, it is, if within the Land of Promise, to be put to the 'herem'; if outside those limits, to be admitted to the same sort of mercy as the Greeks gave to Troy. Now, in Luke, we find Christ bidding the Seventy offer peace to the cities they assail on *their* campaigns; if the peace is accepted, well; if not, the city is to be symbolically handed over to God. True, it is not for *them* to execute the judgment; that is reserved for God alone at the Great Day; but it will be worse for those cities then than for Sodom or Gomorrah.

But we observe, further, that this severe sentence is reserved for those cities only which belong to *Israel*, and over which, therefore, Christ had the same claim as Israel had over the Land of Promise. The disciples are forbidden to go to the towns of the Samaritans or of the Gentiles. Nay, looking back over a few verses, we find a very significant incident related. A village had denied lodging to Christ, and the two sons of Zebedee urged that it should be punished with fire from heaven. But our Lord turned and rebuked them. Now this was a Samaritan city: the terrible future 'herem,' therefore, appropriate to the Jewish cities, was out of place here.

It seems to me, then, hardly to be doubted that Christ's commission to the Seventy was given in military language, and contains an adaptation to *His* warfare of the Mosaic war-regulations as given in Deuteronomy. Whether His disciples quite understood its figurative phraseology may be doubted. There appears to be a certain harshness in it, as reported, which conflicts with the gentleness of Jesus as seen elsewhere. This, of course, is

a difficult question, the solution of which depends on the solution of the whole Synoptic problem. But, even as the narrative stands, we can see a vast correction of the old Law. The new warriors are to use peaceful weapons; they bring the Kingdom nigh not with violence but with persuasion. Even if contumeliously repelled, they are not to apply the spiritual 'herem' themselves, but, by a symbolic and solemn act, to leave the final decision to an infallible tribunal. From the 'conquered' cities they are to take no spoil: though the soldier is worthy of his hire, they come unprovided with shoes, scrip, or brass, and accept no gifts but such as are willingly offered.

May we not imagine that this discourse made a special impression on the mind of Paul?

E. E. KELLETT.

Cambridge.

ἐπιούσιον (Luke xi. 3, Matt. vi. 11).

THERE can be little doubt that this peculiar epithet in the petition for '(daily) bread' is, not to say a coinage of St. Luke's, an apparently legitimate contraction of the full expression in the prodigal son's request, δός μοι τὸ ἐπιβαλλον μέρος τῆς οὐσίας (15¹²). The counterpart of this, in the Lord's Prayer, may then be filled in as follows: τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιβάλλοντα τῆς οὐσίας δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν (or σήμερον). This view would explain the τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν as simply emphasizing the contrast, already implied in τὸν ἄρτον, to the immediacy of full and maybe final settlement upon a son of his inheritance or share (μέρος τῆς οὐσίας), but if the phrase was intended as a safeguard or protest against the spirit of discontent or impatient avarice, it may have gradually displaced the simpler and more direct σήμερον (cp. the thissness of such passages as Mt 6³⁴, Lk 23⁴³, and the emphatic phrase in Ac 20²⁸, ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ, as well as the frequent הַיּוֹם in the M.T.). We may now render the petition thus: Our loaf that falleth to us of substance, give us this day.

D. T. JAMES.

Wrexham.

The Disciple whom Jesus loved.

THANK you for publishing the contribution of B. Grey Griffith in the current number of

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, under the title of 'The Disciple whom Jesus loved.' I have long felt the difficulty of accepting the Fourth Gospel as the work of a Galilean fisherman. Could Mr. Griffith go a little further with his exploration in this direction to see if there are any further indications that the Fourth Gospel was written by Lazarus?

But on the other side; he says: 'This disciple is known to the high priest . . . this cannot apply to John the Apostle. Why should he have this acquaintance which Peter had not?' Has Mr. Griffith considered the indications that the family of Zebedee was much better off than the family of Peter? I disagree that 'they belong to the same social class.' We are told that Zebedee not only had his sons to assist him in fishing, but also

'hired servants,' which seems to indicate a higher social position than the other fisherman-disciples. Moreover, the request of Zebedee's wife concerning her two sons is just what we might have expected from a loving mother who moved in a higher social sphere than did the families of the other disciples. There may be other indications that Zebedee's family was of a superior social standing to Peter's. Grant this, then why should not an important Galilean family have acquaintance with the high priest at Jerusalem?

I think Mr. Griffith should go on, this may prove to be one of the most important discoveries of the day, and go far in solving the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. H. MUDIE DRAPER.

Leicester.

Entre Nous.

'THE CHILDREN'S GREAT TEXTS.'

MESSRS. T. & T. Clark have now issued the last three volumes of *The Children's Great Texts of the Bible*. The last volume of all contains an Index of Subjects for the whole work. It runs from page 305 to page 319, and has been prepared with care. It will serve the preacher who prefers a topic to a text, or who, taking a text, is in search of an illustration or an idea.

The reception given to the Children's Great Texts is a very great gratification. Their originality, for they are entirely original, has been recognized, their lightness of touch also, the Biblical breadth of their teaching, and the aptness of their illustrations. These characteristics have all been noted by the reviewers and in private correspondence. In the near future the Children's sermon is likely to be an important factor in the recovery of the day when it will again be said, 'I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord.' But it has to be a children's sermon. If the children do not themselves listen to it, no pleasure on the part of their parents will make up for that. For if we do not win the children to a love of churchgoing we shall fail.

The price of the Children's Great Texts originally fixed has been found to be too low, the cost

of printing and publishing having risen considerably. But the publishers still offer the set of six volumes at the original price of 45s. net, and will do so up to June 30. Thereafter it will be 54s. net, and may have to be raised still higher.

SOME TOPICS.

Official.

'How many a sermon have we listened to on the familiar story of Jacob or Esau, and noted the clumsy efforts of the preacher to reconcile the favouritism of Jehovah for the crafty patriarch with ordinary standards of fairplay and rectitude. The best in this kind is the reported comment of a Highland minister in Arran. He had laboured through the story, endeavouring to draw the proper lessons from it, but plainly ill at ease about the divine sanction extended to such gross deception; and at last he was moved to say, ingeniously transferring his own dissatisfaction to those whom he was addressing: "You may think that this is a very strange way for the Lord to act in, but you must remember, my friends, that the Almighty may do many things in his *offeicial* capacity which he would not do as a private individual."¹

¹ A. Seth Pringle-Pattison, *The Duty of Candour in Religious Teaching*, p. 29.

Democracy and War.

The photographs in Professor Ernest Scott's *Men and Thought in Modern History* (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net) give the book an appearance of 'popularity.' But in no bad sense is it popular. Mr. Scott is Professor of History in the University of Melbourne, and a scholar. What he has done is to write the history of ideas in our time, associating each great idea with an outstanding exponent of it. Thus he has the advantage that biography brings, our interest in one another. His sketch of his 'men' is in every case clear and forceful. At the end he gives a few hints on literature, and then adds a page or two of pertinent quotation. Thus. At the end of 'Lincoln and Democracy' he quotes Sir John Harrington, John Stuart Mill, Walt Whitman, David Hume, W. R. Inge, and others. We give the quotation from Dean Inge. At the end of 'Tolstoy and Pacifism' he quotes Woodrow Wilson, W. R. Inge, Lady Bessborough, H. G. Wells, Theodore Roosevelt, and ends with George Santayana. We give the quotation from Santayana.

'It is the deepest tragedy of modern history that every civilised nation seems compelled to choose one of two forms of government, both so bad that it is not easy to see which is the worse. On the one side is the Prussian system — efficient, economical and honest, which ends in putting the civilian under the heel of the soldier, with his brutal, blundering diplomacy and methods of frightfulness. . . . On the other side is a squalid anarchy of democracy—wasteful, inefficient and generally corrupt, with a government which quails before every agitation and pays blackmail to every conspiracy, and in which sooner or later those who pay taxes are systematically pillaged by those who impose them, until the economical structure of the state is destroyed.'

'There are panegyrists of war who say that without a periodical bleeding a race decays and loses its manhood. Experience is directly opposed to this shameless assertion. It is war that wastes a nation's wealth, chokes its industries, kills its flower, narrows its sympathies, condemns it to be governed by adventurers, and leave the puny, deformed and unmanly to breed the next generation. Internecine war, foreign and civil, brought about the greatest set-back which the Life of Reason has ever suffered; it exterminated the Greek and Italian aristocracies. Instead of being

descended from heroes, modern nations are descended from slaves; and it is not their bodies only that show it. . . . To call war the soil of courage and virtue is like calling debauchery the soil of love.'

NEW POETRY.

George Barlow.

In an introductory note to this volume of *Selected Poems* by George Barlow (Glaisher; 7s. 6d. net) we are told why and on what principles the selection has been made. 'This selection of George Barlow's poems has been made under a clause in his will, and its first appeal will naturally be to those who knew him personally. Probably each of these will regret various omissions or inclusions, but the compiler has made it his business to work with the sole intention of giving what was artistically best in the very large amount of verse which George Barlow wrote and published. The only exception to this rule has been the inclusion—for the sake of association or in deference to the wish of his literary executor or his own recorded preference—of two or three of the longer poems.'

A considerable number are sonnets, and the sonnets are the best. There may not be a Blanco White among them, but there are one or two which might be included in the next great collection of English sonnets. As striking as anything in the book is the elegy on Charles Kingsley. We shall quote, however—

THE DEAD CHILD.

But yesterday she played with childish things,
With toys and painted fruit.

To-day she may be speeding on bright wings
Beyond the stars! We ask. The stars are
mute.

But yesterday her doll was all in all;
She laughed and was content.

To-day she will not answer, if we call:
She dropped no toys to show the road she
went.

But yesterday she smiled and ranged with art
Her playthings on the bed.

To-day and yesterday are leagues apart!
She will not smile to-day, for she is dead.

Charles Allan.

The Rev. Charles Allan, M.A., does not properly belong here, as America would say, for he is no poet nor pretends to be. But in his volume of Sermons entitled *The New World* (Greenock: M'Kelvie; 6s. net) there is a poem quoted which we mean to quote after him, and the poem will be at home in this place. As for the sermons, they are quite new. Their manner is quite new and their matter—for the War has come between them and all the sermons ever preached before. They touch things made urgent by the War—such things as the life beyond.

'I have been ranging these last days through the literature of this subject, reading whatever I could find on the difficulties of belief in the hereafter, and the exercise has not in the least depressed me. It has left me simply "prancing" with faith. For there is not an argument that really touches the essential point, not one. Not the argument from the relation of mental activities to physical structure. For everything that can be said about that is equally compatible with the theory that the brain does not create the mind but is only the instrument on which for a time the mind is playing. Not the argument from appearances which for most men is the greatest difficulty. It looks so like an end. But "things are not what they seem." To the uninstructed, modern theories of the nature of matter sound more impossible than the most grotesque of fairy tales. To reduce this seeming gross and palpable substance to "something of the tenuity of thought itself"; to tell me that what I call solid is made so by incredible velocity of movement! that seems to mock my common sense. Yet the fact is even so. Modern science has marched to all its victories with this strange device emblazoned on its banners: "By faith we *dis*believe the evidence of our senses." To judge by the testimony of the senses is to negative every important advance that science has made. Of physical science no less than of spiritual is it true that a man must walk, not by sight, but by insight. It is by correction of sense impressions, by intelligence, that we win all our knowledge.'

It is at the end of this sermon that the poem comes. It is signed D. D. B., 'a friend of my own whose son gave his young life for the world's saving in Flanders' field.' It is offered

TO ANY FATHER.

Say not the boy is dead, but rather say
He's but a little farther on the way,
Impatient sooner to behold the view—
At the next turning you may see it too.
Say he's a child again, early to bed,
On night's soft pillow fain to lay his head.

Say he is off to track the mountain stream,
And linger by the side in boyish dream.
Say by immortal waters now at rest,
He clasps a thousand memories to his breast.
Say to his wondering quests wise angels, smiling,
Tell the true story of the world's beguiling.
Say on heroic task his soul is thrilling,
Where noble dream hath noble deeds fulfilling.
Say that he feasts with comrades tried and true,
But in his heart the banquet waits for you.
Say in the Presence, at a gentle word
He shows the wound-marks to his wounded Lord.
*Say never he is dead, but rather say,
He's but a little farther on the way.*

Bertram Lloyd.

An Anthology of Humanitarian Poetry has been made by Mr. Bertram Lloyd, who gives it the title of *The Great Kinship* (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net). Mr. Lloyd's paradise on earth is the fellowship of birds and beasts, and that is the Paradise he looks forward to in heaven. Think then of his disgust when he finds 'one thirteenth-century Christian mystic, the poetess Mechthild of Magdeburg, going so far as to exclude animals and birds from her Earthly Paradise, on the ground that God has reserved it for mankind alone, so that he may dwell there undisturbed. A strange sort of Paradise, truly!' His introduction is delightful reading, and as religious as delightful—for what is there on earth that gives itself more readily to good reading than the love of all living things, both great and small?

For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all.

His notes, too, are full of the information which only a long-lived lover of animals can possess. The quotations are wholly poetical. We shall quote one of them. The author is V. H. Friedlaender.

TO A BLUE TIT.

Day after day you who are free as air
(And how much freer, then, than I!)
Venture your birthright, dare
That heavenly liberty, to fly
And feed upon my hand: I marvel why.
No other bird of your bright company
Commits a folly so divine!
Their chatter bids you be
Wary of guile—of some design
That you alone are conscious is not mine.
And even I, with less to lose than you,
I, wingless prisoner of the dust,
Would shun risks you renew
Each morning, not because you must,
But in a sweet wild miracle of trust.

Bird, as you call me to the window-ledge
 With flashes and blue flutterings,
 It seems the grey world's edge;
 And, with the thrill your light touch brings,
 I am your kin and know the lift of wings!

A.E.

The literature most likely to live is coming from Ireland, the poetical literature without doubt. And of the poets of Ireland the securest of immortality, if a contemporary can ever judge, is Mr. George Russell, the man who writes as A.E.

The book before us is in prose. It is the second edition of *Imaginations and Reveries* (Maunsell & Roberts; 10s. 6d. net), a volume of prose essays. This edition contains four new essays, and we have placed it here because one of them ends with a poem which we mean to quote.

The new essays are all concerned with the Irish question. A.E. has the state of Ireland at heart as truly as any Irishman that ever gave his life for his country. And he pleads in this book for a settlement. He pleads for it, and he states the terms of it. For if he is a poet, he is also a most forcible writer on practical politics.

In the essay entitled, 'The New Nation,' A.E. reminds loyalist and nationalist that they are both Irishmen, and must co-operate to build the nation that is to be. He entreats the loyalist to regard the nationalist as of the same race as himself, and the nationalist the loyalist. 'There is scarce an Ulsterman, whether he regards his ancestors as settlers or not, who is not allied through marriage by his forbears to the ancient race. There is in his veins the blood of the people who existed before Patrick, and he can look backward through time to the legends of the Red Branch, the Fianna, and the gods as the legends of his people. It would be as difficult to find even on the Western Coast a family which has not lost in the same way its Celtic purity of race. The character of all is fed from many streams which have mingled in them and have given them a new distinctiveness. And then he turns to their sacrifices. Did Irishmen fall in 'the astonishing enterprise of Easter Week'? Irishmen fell also in the Great War. He can commemorate both.

Their dream had left me numb and cold,
 But yet my spirit rose in pride,
 Refashioning in burnished gold

The images of those who died,
 Or were shut in the penal cell.

Here's to you, Pearsé, your dream not mine,
 But yet the thought, for this you fell,
 Has turned life's water into wine.

*You who have died on Eastern hills
 Or fields of France as undismayed,
 Who lit with interlinked wills
 The long heroic barricade,
 You, too, in all the dreams you had,
 Thought of some thing for Ireland done.
 Was it not so, Oh, shining lad,
 What lured you, Alan Anderson?*

I listened to high talk from you,
 Thomas McDonagh, and it seemed
 The words were idle, but they grew
 To nobleness by death redeemed.
 Life cannot utter words more great
 Than life may meet by sacrifice,
 High words were equalled by high fate,
 You paid the price. You paid the price.

*You who have fought on fields afar,
 That other Ireland did you wrong
 Who said you shadowed Ireland's star,
 Nor gave you laurel wreath nor song.
 You proved by death as true as they,
 In mightier conflicts played your part,
 Equal your sacrifice may weigh,
 Dear Kettle, of the generous heart.*

The hope lives on age after age,
 Earth with its beauty might be won
 For labour as a heritage,
 For this has Ireland lost a son.
 This hope unto a flame to fan
 Men have put life by with a smile,
 Here's to you, Connolly, my man,
 Who cast the last torch on the pile.

*You too, had Ireland in your care,
 Who watched o'er pits of blood and mire,
 From iron roots leap up in air
 Wild forests, magical, of fire;
 Yet while the Nuts of Death were shed
 Your memory would ever stray
 To your own isle. Oh, gallant dead—
 This wreath, Will Redmond, on your clay.*

Here's to you, men I never met,
 Yet hope to meet behind the veil,
 Thronged on some starry parapet,
 That looks down upon Innisfail,
 And sees the confluence of dreams
 That clashed together in our night,
 One river, born from many streams,
 Roll in one blaze of blinding light.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
 and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
 Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary com-
 munications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings
 Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.